THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1884.

Art. I.—THE SYRIAN CHURCH OF TRAVANCORE.

TO turn away from the stirring controversies and the vigorous life that characterize the Church of England at the present time to the confused records and the partially dormant state of the ancient Syrian Church in South India, is like forsaking the busy turmoil of a modern city for the tangled recesses of an Indian jungle. The ground is cumbered by the wild growth of ages, but there is a rude dignity about its calm existence, and perhaps so grand a possibility hidden in its neglected soil, that we feel, as we study the past and the present, that there is more than enough to call for our respect, our sympathy, and if need be our help.

The early history of the Syrian Church is obscured by legends and clouded by myths. In the first place, we find that several different theories have been held as to the mode of the introduction of Christianity into this part of the world. For a long time it was supposed that the evangelization of South India was accomplished by St. Thomas, the Apostle. La Croze (the universal scholar, as Gibbon calls him) has drawn up the following interesting account of the legend from all the authorities he could collect:

> In the division of all the parts of the world which was made among the holy Apostles, India fell to the lot of St. Thomas, who, after having established Christianity in Arabia Felix and in the island of Dioscoride, afterwards called Socotora, arrived at Cranganore, where the principal king of the Coast of Malabar then resided. It was there that the fabulous adventures happened of which we read in this Apostle's Life, written by the pretended Abdias of Babylon. The holy Apostle, having established many churches at Cranganore, passed to Coulan (now Quilon), a celebrated town of the same coast, where he converted many persons to Christianity. Having departed to the other coast, now known by the name of Coromandel, he stopped at Meliapore, a town which the Euro-

peans call St. Thomé, where he is said to have converted the king and all his people. He went from thence to China, and remained in a town called Camballé, where he made numerous conversions and built many churches.

St. Thomas returned from China to Meliapore, where the great success which attended his labours among the heathen excited against him the hatred and envy of two Brahmins who are the priests of the idolatrous superstition of India. These men stirred up the people, who combined to stone the holy Apostle. After his execution, one of the Brahmins, observing that he still breathed, pierced him with a lance, which put an end to his life. [1]

Such an origin would lend additional interest to the Syrian Church if we could accept the story. Unfortunately it appears to be no more than a legend. The only evidence given to support it is the fact that the Christians of this district have constantly been known as "the St. Thomé Christians."

A more probable explanation of the name, however, furnishes at the same time a more likely account of the introduction of Christianity. We learn from the "Kerul Oodputtee," the ancient Malabar history, that in the sixth century a wealthy Christian merchant named Thomé Cannaner, or Thomas Cana, landed at Cranganore, where he was well received, and was induced to settle by great privileges conferred upon him. This man was usually called Mar Thomas, and after him probably the converts were called "St. Thomé Christians."

But when we speak of the Christianity of these converts it must be remembered that their faith was not of the orthodox type. The reign of the Emperor Theodosius II. of Rome was signalized by the development and suppression of the Nestorian heresy.[2] Driven from the Empire, the doctrines and adherents of Nestorius found a refuge among the Christians of Persia. The Church of Persia had been founded by the missionaries of Syria, and it was in the school of Edessa that the rising generations of the faithful imbibed their theological idiom. Its head, Ibas, was favourable to Nestorius, and translated some works of Diodore of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the masters of Nestorius, into Syriac. The writings of these teachers, in default of those of Nestorius himself, whose works had been as far as possible destroyed, were diligently read by the Nestorians, and propagated the errors from which the heresy sprang. Thus from the school of Edessa Nestorian-

---

[1] La Croze, tome i. bk. i. p. 59.

[2] The tenets of Nestorius may be briefly summarized thus: He discriminated with too great nicety the humanity of his *Master*, Christ, from the Divinity of his *Lord*, Jesus. The Virgin Mary he revered as the mother of Christ, but he was offended at the title "Mother of God," a title which was, he believed, "calculated to alarm the timorous, to mislead the simple, to amuse the profane, and to justify, by a seeming resemblance, the old genealogy of Olympus."

ism was disseminated in Persia and India. The Pepper Coast of Malabar, and the isles of the ocean, Socotora and Ceylon, were peopled with an increasing multitude of Christians whose bishops and clergy derived their ordination from Babylon.

Yet another origin has been ascribed to the Syrian Church. It has been thought probable that St. Mark, after the establishment of the Church at Alexandria, would not have neglected the opportunities offered by the large commerce carried on between that city and India, of sending Christian teachers to the coast of Malabar. There is, however, scarcely any evidence to recommend this theory; and if such a mission was sent, its orthodox converts were soon absorbed into the ranks of the heretic settlers.

The writing of ancient history consists chiefly in the careful weighing of conflicting probabilities; and in this case, although the second theory I have mentioned seems to carry a greater weight of evidence than either of the others, it is impossible to determine absolutely which of the three is correct. The earliest positive evidence we possess as to the Syrian Christians is that of Cosmas, an Alexandrian merchant, called from his travels Indicopleustes. He visited Malabar in the sixth century, and affirms the existence of a flourishing Christian Church under a bishop who came from Persia, where he was ordained. This is supported by the testimony of the "Kerul Oodputtee" where there is mention made of two Syrian or Chaldean ecclesiastics named Mar Sabro and Mar Brodt, at Coulan, about a hundred years after the foundation of that city. They were welcomed by the Rajah, and the church which they built was still in existence when Pedro Alvarez Cabral first visited Coulan to establish Portuguese commerce in India. The grants and privileges which they received from the Rajah were engraved on copper plates to which a curious history is attached. They were shown in the sixteenth century to Archbishop Menezes at Tevalacare, and after lying hidden for two centuries they were recovered in 1806 by Lieutenant-Colonel Macaulay, and copper-plate facsimiles were placed in the University Library at Cambridge, by Dr. Buchanan.

We now arrive at the period when the infant Church is brought into contact both with the civil power and with Mohammedanism; and it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the firm footing on which it was established, as well as the prosperity it now began to enjoy, were due in no small degree to the Episcopal form of government under which it was organized. In the ninth century the district of Malabar was ruled by an aristocratic form of government, under various castes of Brahmins. These obtained their power from a division of the whole territory into lots by a king named

Shermanoo Permaloo, who appears to have acquired sovereignty by rebelling against the king by whom he had been appointed viceroy. Among the Malayalim the highest caste are the Namboory Brahmins, whose privilege it was to attend and perform the religious services in the temples. The second caste consists of the Nairs, who were the military tribe; and in the hands of these two chief divisions almost all important functions were vested.

It is said that the introduction of Mohammedanisn into South India was accomplished by the conversion of this king, Shermanoo Permaloo; but all accounts agree in representing him as not only tolerant, but favourably disposed towards the Christians. Under his auspices they attained considerable power. The numbers of the immediate descendants of Mar Thomas were augmented by accessions from the Christians of the Coromandel Coast, who had fled, under the stress of persecution, to the mountainous districts. Encouraged by the government of Shermanoo Permaloo, these settled in the interior of Cochin, Cranganore, and Travancore, and soon became identified with the original St. Thomé Christians, and shared their privileges. The whole body of Christians enjoyed the same rank as the Nairs, and were in every respect on a social equality with that caste. Gradually they became independent of the heathen authorities; after a time they were left to the government of their own Bishops in civil as well as ecclesiastical matters; and finally, with less of gratitude than of enterprise, they shook off the yoke of their heathen rulers, and elected a king of their own nation. The first to bear that dignity was Baliartes, who took the title of Rajah of the Christians of St. Thomas. But this state of independence did not last very long. The last of the independent Rajahs, having no children of his own, adopted the Rajah of Diamper for his heir. This man was a heathen, and he succeeded to all the regal power over the Christians of South India. Afterwards, by a similar adoption, they passed under the jurisdiction of the Rajah of Cochin, to whom they were subject when the Portuguese reached India. In spite, however, of the fact that the kingly power was in the hands of a heathen, the Syrian Christians still enjoyed a large proportion of their ancient privileges. They were still practically governed by their Bishop in matters civil as well as ecclesiastical; and even in the territories of neighbouring rulers their presence was welcomed, since it was recognised that their industrious habits, displayed chiefly in the cultivation of the pepper-vine, contributed largely to the general prosperity of the state.

We now possess scarcely any records of the internal history of the Church during this period of prosperity. The Indian

trade fell into the hands of the Venetian, Genevese, and Florentine merchants successively; but, meanwhile, no attempt was made to effect the conversion of the Malayalim or the Syrians to the Roman Catholic faith.

The first adventurer who was instrumental in bringing the St. Thomé Christians under the notice of Europe was Pedro Alvarez Cabral, who landed at Cranganore, a town on the Malabar coast, between Calicut and Cochin, and took back with him to Portugal two brothers, Matthias and Joseph, members of the Church at Cranganore. Soon after their arrival at Lisbon Matthias, the elder, died, and of Joseph nothing further is known than that he visited Rome and Venice, and then, returning to Portugal, sailed to his native land.[1]

In the year 1502 Vasco de Gama, Admiral of the King of Portugal, arrived at Cochin with his fleet. The St. Thomé Christians having ascertained that he was a representative of a Christian monarch, sent deputies begging De Gama to take them under his protection, at the same time presenting him with a staff of wood painted with vermilion, mounted at each end with silver, and ornamented with three bells. This, they told him, had been the sceptre of their kings, the last of whom had lately died. The Admiral welcomed the deputation and dismissed them with many fair promises, but at present he could give them no material assistance.

Here was the first point of contact between the Syrian Church of Malabar on the one hand, and Portuguese religion and civilization on the other. It was an occasion full of great possibilities for the Syrians. Doubtless they looked forward with eager anticipation to an era of renewed prosperity. They were hoping great things from the Portuguese alliance, but they were too sanguine, too trustful.

As we look back on the history of the Syrian Church during the three centuries following this visit, we see clearly enough that the year 1502 marked the commencement of an age of trouble and decay. Hitherto the freedom of conscience enjoyed by these people had fostered in them habits of industry, sobriety, and chastity, quite exceptional among the races of South India, and as a result they had attained a position of considerable power. Henceforth another influence was at work in their midst. With the Portuguese came the Jesuits, with the Jesuits the Inquisition, with the Jesuits and the Inquisition came misery, strife, and ruin.

Before entering more fully on the history of the sixteenth

---

[1] A description of Joseph's travels was published in Latin under the title of "Voyages of Joseph the Indian."

century, it will be interesting to ascertain what was the condition of the Syrian Christians when first the Portuguese became acquainted with them. Politically their influence was, as we have seen, peculiarly great. Their obligations to their Pagan rulers were represented merely by the payment of tribute, and the equipment of a contingent of troops in time of war. The area occupied by them extended far beyond their present limits. Now chiefly confined to the states of Travancore and Cochin, they then had churches all over the Malabar country, the headquarters of their Bishop being at Angamalé. Of the precise numbers of the population living under the jurisdiction of the Bishop we have no record, but the numerous and magnificent ruins of Christian places of worship still remaining clearly indicate the existence of a large and wealthy community; and we are told that within the dominions of the Rajahs of Cochin and Travancore alone their churches numbered at least one hundred and ten.[1] Meanwhile, all accounts agree in describing the Christians themselves as a race far superior to their neighbours in mental, moral, and physical development. Physically they were, as a rule, tall, well built, and rather lighter in colour than the Indians. The Portuguese historians record that they bore a high character for courtesy and filial affection. They were strongly gifted with the faculty of wonder, listening eagerly to any strange or novel story. In spite of the heat of the climate, and the licentious customs of the country, they maintained a chaste and simple mode of life. Although the men always carried weapons, quarrels were rare and murders still fewer among them. On entering a church they deposited their arms in the porch, resuming them as they passed out. From eight years of age until twenty-eight the men were trained to the use of arms; and "the more Christians a Pagan prince had in his dominions the more was he feared and respected by his neighbours." In their commercial dealings they displayed great fidelity and honesty. They were charitable, kind to their slaves, and particularly sober. For criminal offences they were answerable to their Pagan rulers, but in civil affairs they were under the jurisdiction of their Bishop, who, with his Archdeacon, decided all their differences in his character of Judge and Pastor. Such is the picture of the St. Thomé Christians drawn for us by the Portuguese historian Gouvea, and the Italian Da Siena, both of them Roman Catholics, and both unlikely to dress their subject in colours brighter than it deserves.

As to their theological position, it appears to be certain that

[1] Paper by F. Wrede, Asiatic Researches, vol. vii.

when the Portuguese began to take cognizance of the teaching and discipline of the Church of Malabar, they found Nestorianism so fully established, that the time could not be remembered when any other doctrine had been taught. The ecclesiastical organization was completed in the persons of a Bishop, who derived his authority from the Patriarch of Mosul, and a body of Catanars, including both priests and deacons, whose duty it was to study and expound to the people the Syriac writings.

Such was the position of the Syrian Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Hitherto they had held no intercourse with their Western fellow-religionists, and their first experience could scarcely have prepared them for the sequel. In 1542-51 their country was visited by the great "Apostle of India," Francis Xavier. Whatever estimate we may form of the permanent value of Xavier's work, there can at least be no doubt that his earnest zeal and devotion were as far as possible removed from the persecuting vigour of subsequent Romish envoys. Xavier's mission did not exert any important influence on the Syrian Christians; but in 1545 more decided measures were taken. In that year Father Vincent, a monk of the Franciscan Order, was sent to inquire into the state of the Church, and, if possible, to induce the Christians to acknowledge the Papal supremacy. He was at first well received; but, when the real object of his mission became apparent, the people refused to entertain his advances. He then had recourse to the Viceroy of India, with whose permission he established a college at Cranganore, where he hoped to train Indian youths in the literature and rites of the Roman Church. His plans in that direction were, however, doomed to disappointment. Although a supply of youths was forthcoming, they had no sooner been fitted for their work than the people, regarding them as apostates, refused to allow them to perform ministerial functions, or even to enter the churches.

The efforts of the Franciscans having failed, the Jesuits took the matter in hand. At first they tried persuasive measures. A college was established at Vaipicotta, one league from Cranganore, under Antonio Guedes Morales, and the Syrian youths were now allowed to retain the language and dress of the Catanars. But, notwithstanding the most careful instruction, the students were no sooner ordained than they refused absolutely to preach against their ancient prelates, and the Jesuits often experienced the chagrin of hearing them, even in their own college, maintain their former opinions, and make mention of the Patriarch of Babylon in their prayers. An attempt was next made to remove the Syrian Bishop, Mar Joseph. He was accused of Nestorianism, and despatched to Portugal, with a

request that he might be forwarded to Rome and never sent back. In Portugal, however, he so far succeeded in ingratiating himself with the Queen Regent and the Inquisitor-General, that, having promised to purge his diocese of all former errors, and to bring it into obedience to the Church of Rome, he was allowed to return to India with letters of recommendation from the Queen to the Viceroy and the Archbishop of Goa. As soon as Mar Joseph found himself among his own people he resumed his former doctrines. In the end he was seized by the Jesuits and transported to Rome, where he died. The removal of Mar Joseph, however, did not tend to tranquillize matters in Malabar. At the first appearance of danger another Bishop, Mar Abraham, was sent from Babylon, who adopted the tactics of his predecessor. He was sent to Rome, abjured his errors there, repeated his abjuration whilst he was in the power of the Jesuits at Goa, and disregarded it as soon as he felt safe among his own people. Finding that his health was failing, Mar Abraham applied to his Patriarch for a coadjutor, and in consequence Mar Simeon, a young priest, was appointed. Soon, however, serious dissensions arose between the two Bishops, which were at length terminated by the capture of the younger by the Jesuits. Still Mar Abraham was at large, and at length, in 1595, Don Alexis de Menezes, Archbishop of Goa, was instructed by the Pope, Clement VIII., to make a strict inquiry into the life, morals, and doctrine of the Bishop, and, if he should be found guilty, to arrest him and conduct him to Goa, there to await the final decision of the Holy See. In the meantime Menezes was to appoint an Apostolical Vicar to the diocese, and was carefully to exclude any prelate not sent from Rome.

Menezes lost no time in carrying out the commands of the Pope, but Mar Abraham retired to Angamalé, to which town the Portuguese could not gain access, and, whilst negotiations were still pending, he died, leaving his Archdeacon George as his representative. On the death of the Bishop, Menezes appointed a Jesuit named Francisco Roz, a man of virtue, learning, and prudence, well versed in the Syriac and Malabar languages, together with the chief of the Jesuit College at Vaipicotta, to assist the Archdeacon George in his office of Vicar-General. George was compelled to subscribe a profession of faith which, after the manner of his race, he speedily repudiated. This duplicity exasperated Menezes to such a degree, that, notwithstanding that the country was disturbed by war, he resolved at all hazards to proceed in person to the Serra, and to reduce by his power and presence, not only the Archdeacon, but also all his clergy, into obedience to the Pope. This was an energetic and politic step. If the Jesuits could

once establish a firm hold on the general body of the Church, the battle was won.

Menezes began his visitation of the diocese in 1599. With some difficulty he induced the Archdeacon to meet him at Cochin; but so great was the distrust felt towards the Roman ecclesiastic, and so high the estimation in which the Archdeacon was held by the Christians, that the powerful chieftains, or "panicals" of the diocese, constantly provided him with large escorts of well-armed men. From Cochin the *cortège* repaired to Vaipicotta. Here Menezes, who was the first to arrive, administered confirmation, a sacrament hitherto unknown to the Syrians. On the arrival of the Archdeacon, sentence of excommunication was pronounced against all persons who, in the diocese of Angamalé, should dare to give to the Patriarch of Babylon the title of Universal Pastor of the Catholic Church, a title which belonged solely to the Roman Pontiff. This document naturally produced great consternation amongst the St. Thomé Christians, but Menezes was not without some success in persuading a few of the Catanars to adopt his views. After leaving Vaipicotta, the Roman envoy visited many of the churches in the diocese, performing mass, administering the sacraments, and enjoining auricular confession. He was also careful to engage the support of the Ranee and of the Rajah of Cochin. The former he bribed, the latter he bullied, into complaisance. The first place in which he met with any considerable success was Carturté, a town to the east of Calicut. Here the people received his ministrations, and he could at length boast of having procured the conversion of the whole population, as well as that of some neighbouring villages. But this, after all, was a very meagre result, and accordingly he determined on making a decisive effort on a large scale. A synod was ordered to assemble at Diamper, at which the whole question of doctrinal and ecclesiastical difficulties should be discussed.

The struggle between the Roman Catholic emissaries and the Syrian ecclesiastics had now reached its culminating point. A long series of faithless negotiations had been carried on, in which both parties appear to have set aside considerations of truth and honour. The Syrian Archdeacon and his flock, far from resting their action on the inherent justice of their cause, had had recourse to tricks and falsehoods as detestable as those by means of which the Papist missionaries had striven to gain a firm hold on their Church. And, bearing in mind the personal character of the leaders of either party, the issue could not be doubtful. Menezes, in all his proceedings, had constantly displayed a vigour and determination, a recklessness in the means he employed, and a devotion to one settled object,

which were sure to carry the day against an opponent so weak and prevaricating as the Archdeacon George. The result of this momentous Synod was therefore the temporary subjugation of the whole, and a permanent enthralment of a part, of the Church of Malabar.

The decrees of the Synod furnish the best evidence as to the tenets of the Syrian Church at that time. The Syrians, whilst holding the doctrines of the Atonement, the necessity of a new Birth, and the Trinity in Unity, were accused of the following "heretical" opinions: They rejected the Supremacy of the Pope; denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation, admitting only the spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament; they condemned the adoration of images; knew nothing of the intercession of saints; did not believe in Purgatory, nor in masses and prayers for the dead; they made no use of the holy oil in Baptism; had no knowledge of Extreme Unction nor of Auricular Confession; they allowed the clergy to marry; held only two orders, viz., Priests and Deacons, their Bishops being called Metropolitans or Metrans rather as a name of dignity than as forming a distinct Order; they consecrated the elements at the Holy Communion with prayer, believing that without the operation of the Holy Ghost the words of the priest were of no avail; they administered in both kinds; admitted members of other Churches to Holy Communion; in all questions of doctrine they appealed to the authority of the Holy Scriptures as decisive; and they held three Sacraments, viz., Baptism, the Holy Communion, and Holy Orders.[1] These doctrines and practices were severally and collectively condemned, conformity to the Canons of the Council of Trent was enjoined, the Syrian books were ordered to be surrendered for destruction or correction as the Jesuits might determine, and submission to the Inquisition was commanded. A solemn *Te Deum* brought the Synod to a close on June 26, 1599.[2]

The history of the next fifty years presents few points of interest. The Episcopal dignity was held by a succession of ecclesiastics belonging to the Society of Jesus. They forced on the Syrians the use of the Latin language, thus preventing the participation of the people in public worship, and altogether they behaved with intolerable pride and arrogance. The Christians sent frequent complaints to Rome without obtaining the least redress. At length, in 1656, they resolved to

[1] See appendix A, vol. ii. of "Hough's Christianity in India."

[2] Menezes promptly started on a second visitation of the diocese, returning to Goa in November, after an absence of ten months. To his determined energy was due the subjugation of the whole region to Rome. We cannot but mourn for the consequences that followed his success. From 1599 dates the decadence of the Syrian Church.

renounce the domination of the Roman Prelate named Don Garzia, and to choose a bishop of their own. They chose as their representative Thomas the Archdeacon, but, in order that they might obtain a bishop whose ordination should be unquestionable, they wrote simultaneously to their ancient Patriarch at Mosul, to the Patriarch of the Copts in Egypt, and of the Jacobites in Syria, asking of each that a bishop might be sent without delay. At the time when these letters arrived, Attalla, a former Bishop of the Syrian Church, was residing with the Patriarch of the Copts at Cairo, and he was selected to fill the vacant post. He travelled first to Mosul, obtained recommendatory letters from the Patriarch there, and then went on to India. The agents of the Jesuits had meantime taken alarm; the unfortunate Attalla was arrested, condemned by the Inquisition, and executed at Goa. When his arrest became known, the Syrians assembled a considerable force and marched on Metanger, near Cochin, with a view to obtaining possession of the person of Don Garzia. Failing in their design, they took an oath to drive every Jesuit out of the country, and to submit to no authority but that of their own Archdeacon; and then, finding that there was no hope of foreign help, they irregularly consecrated the Archdeacon Thomas at the hands of twelve Catanars.

Meanwhile the task of reducing the recalcitrant Syrians to obedience was entrusted to four Carmelite missionaries. After many attempts two of these men gave up the task and returned to Rome, leaving Père Hyacinthe de St. Vincent and Père Marcell de St. Ives to do what they could. The efforts of these envoys resulted in almost total failure, although the biographer of Hyacinthe de St. Vincent informs us that "what he could not accomplish by the voice of persuasion he effected by force;" and of his plan of operations the same authority says that "he employed with advantage the power of the native princes, so that by imprisonment, by sequestration of property, and by other similar expedients, he gained many souls, and brought back the whole country into the right way"!

The record of the next few years is nothing but a tale of anarchy and confusion. The Jesuits and the Carmelites plotted against each other, and both against the Syrians, and either party made free use of the temporal power whenever the native princes favoured their cause.

But another disturbing element now asserted itself. The Dutch were gradually establishing themselves in Malabar, and in 1663 the death-blow was given to the Portuguese power in India by the surrender of Cochin. One of the first acts of the Dutch authorities was to banish from the coast all European

monks; but although the Syrians were thus protected against their most formidable enemies, they were so far left to their own resources that matters gradually became worse. The effect of two hundred years of continual depression and disturbance shewed itself, and spiritual life was reduced to a very low ebb indeed in Malabar. During the eighteenth century sundry efforts were made to bring about some kind of reformation. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in concert with the Danish missionaries, more than once opened negotiations with the Syrian clergy, but all attempts to arouse them proved unavailing. About 1720 there appear to have been no less than three rival Bishops in the diocese, representing the Nestorian, the Jacobite, and the Romanist sections of the Church respectively; but from that date to the close of the century we have very little detailed information as to the affairs of the Church.

Such was the result of the action of the Romish priests in Malabar. They found the Syrian Church wealthy, vigorous, and powerful; they left it poor, spiritless, and despised. They found the Christians living in peace, holding firmly the fundamental doctrines of the faith, honest and free in their convictions; they left them in a state of anarchy, uncertain what they ought to believe, forbidden to worship God in their native tongue, and unable to use any other. Thus the influence of those who came to bring light and truth was powerful only in introducing darkness and strife. It is a pitiful picture; but after all, the result might well have been anticipated.

With the entrance of the nineteenth century, the general awakening of England to a sense of the responsibilities entailed upon her by the religious needs of her new Indian Empire began to make itself felt.[1] The travels and researches of Dr. Claudius Buchanan stirred the hearts of many. Gradually the eloquence and determination of the men who composed the celebrated Clapham Council forced on the country the conviction that it was an imperative duty, as well as the wisest policy, to remove those restrictions which had hitherto been laid upon all efforts at evangelization in India.

Dr. Buchanan's researches led him to the conclusion that it might be possible and desirable to bring about a union between the Syrian Church and the Church of England. The accounts of his travels in Travancore are singularly interesting. He tells us that in the churches and in the people there was an air of fallen greatness. One of the Catanars said to him,

---

[1] See the account of the negotiations and the war of pamphlets in Kaye's "History of Christianity in India;" also "Church and State in India," in *British Quarterly Review*, No. cxxiii.

"We are in a degenerate state compared with our forefathers. About three hundred years ago an enemy came from the West bearing the name of Christ, but armed with the Inquisition, and compelled us to seek the protection of the native princes. And the native princes have kept us in a state of depression ever since. They indeed recognise our ancient personal privileges, for we rank in general next to the Nairs, the nobility of the country; but they have encroached by degrees on our property, until we have been reduced to the humble state in which you find us."[1] The number of copies of the sacred Scriptures existing in the country was very small and constantly diminishing, many of the Catanars having never so much as seen a copy of the New Testament; and Dr. Buchanan was assured that the greatest blessing the English Church could bestow on them would be the Bible, and the next greatest "some freedom and personal consequence as a people." While visiting the residence of the Metran, Dr. Buchanan laid before this dignitary the advantages that would accrue from a formal union with the Church of England. The proposition was favourably received, and a written answer was returned by the Metran, after consultation with his clergy, to the effect "That a union with the English Church, or at least such a connection as should appear to both Churches practical and expedient, would be a happy event, and favourable to the advancement of religion in India." In 1816, the Church Missionary Society sent the Rev. T. Norton to Allepie, about forty miles to the north of Cochin; and shortly afterwards a college was established by the help of Major Munro, the British Resident at Cottayam, in which the Catanars might obtain a competent education. But the projected union was found to be impossible. Bishop Wilson,[2] on visiting the neighbourhood in 1835, found that the Metran had introduced grave errors. He admitted to ordination boys of twelve and fourteen, conferred Holy Orders for money, and encouraged prayers for the dead. Bishop Wilson did all that was possible to induce reform, but without any solid result, and in the end it was clear that Dr. Buchanan's plan could not be carried out. The explanation of the failure seems to have been that the Syrian ecclesiastics, reduced to great poverty, could not be taught to act on any higher motive than the desire for pecuniary advantage. Their deplorable ignorance produced its natural result in bitter

---

[1] See "Christian Researches in Asia respecting the Syrians." About the time of Dr. Buchanan's visit other efforts were made for the benefit of the Syrians by M. Ringletaube, under the auspices of the London Missionary Society, in 1806.

[2] See Bateman's "Life of Bishop Wilson," vol. ii.

prejudice and doctrinal errors. The committee of the Church Missionary Society were obliged to convey to the missionaries their decided judgment that the Syrians should be brought back to their own ancient and primitive worship and discipline, rather than be induced to adopt the discipline and Liturgy of the English Church.

But although any formal union has been found to be impracticable, the work of the English missionaries has not been lacking in the most valuable results. The rupture in 1837 did not arouse any feeling of hostility between the Syrians and the missionaries. Some thousands of Syrians have joined the Church of England, and a new era of activity has commenced among those who still adhere to their ancient Church. The Church Missionary Society have undoubtedly acted with great wisdom in their dealings in Travancore. Although they have found it impossible to refuse to permit Syrians to leave their own body for the Church of England at their own desire, yet any attempt at proselytizing has been consistently discouraged. Their policy has been rather to encourage the work of reformation from within the Syrian Church itself, than to force a reform upon it from outside, and the result of this policy has been highly satisfactory. The Church Missionary Society has several stations within and around Travancore, and the influence exerted on the Syrian Church by the noble example of the English missionaries has been very striking.[1] The missionaries are frequently invited to preach in Syrian churches, Syrian youths study in the schools under the Society's auspices, for the examination at the Madras University, and in the mission schools the children of Syrians are educated in large numbers.

Meanwhile a vigorous reforming party has arisen among the Syrians themselves. The movement began in 1873, under Mar Athanasius, and although serious divisions have not been lacking from time to time, the progress made has been on the whole very considerable. In 1875 a curious schism commenced. A sect known as "The Six Years' Party" was formed, the leaders of which pretended to have received a Divine revelation to the effect that the second Advent of Christ would take place in six years. This sect indulged in many extravagances, and was joined by nearly five thousand Syrians. The schism is now, however, practically at an end. The six years'

[1] The work of the Rev. H. Baker and the Rev. R. H. Maddox deserves special mention. Writing in 1872, the Rev. R. H. Maddox says, "I doubt whether the history of the Reformation in England during twenty years would give more decided signs of progress and enlightenment, than the history of the last twenty years in reference to the Reformation in this Syrian Church discloses." (Church Missionary Society Report.)

period matured on October 2nd, 1881, and the failure of the prediction had its natural result. The reforming zeal of Mar Athanasius stirred up the enmity of some of the Catanars and of the Patriarch. The latter accordingly visited the diocese in 1875, and succeeded in greatly hampering the efforts of Mar Athanasius. He divided the whole district into six dioceses, appointed a metran for each, and left them to win possession or not as they were able. But, in spite of these and other hostile measures, signs are not lacking that the resuscitation of this ancient Church is real and active. The Syrians have now the Bible in their own language, there is a growing desire that the young especially should be instructed in Christian principles, and it is not, perhaps, too much to hope that, under Divine guidance, the little spark of truth which has slumbered awhile in this dark corner of India has only been waiting the appointed time when its brightness shall once more "give light to them that sit in darkness." As far as numbers are concerned, their position is far better than it was. A recent census gives the following figures as representing the population of the State of Travancore. Mohammedans and Hindus, 1,840,222; Syrian Christians, 300,000; Romanists, 109,000; other Protestants, 57,874. In Cochin there were at the same date, of Mohammedans and Hindus, 460,000; Romanists, 100,000; and Syrians, about 40,000.

These results are satisfactory, but it is a question of considerable importance whether in the end some means should not be sought for uniting, under the same general control, the affairs of the Syrian Church and the other Protestant bodies. At present, matters do not seem to be ripe for any such action. The Syrian Christians, although emancipated from Rome, are far from being free from errors in doctrine, and the wisest course undoubtedly will be to continue to encourage the internal work of reformation. So long as this continues, although the progress may be slow, it will surely be unwise to weaken the hands of the reforming party by attracting from their Church the most able and zealous of their number. But in the future we may, perhaps, look forward with hope and expectation to a time when the case will be different. The extension of the system of Native Church Councils must, of course, be gradual; but it may, by-and-by, be worth considering whether some application of that system cannot be made to the case of the Syrian Church, so as to unite them more or less closely with the other Protestant Christians of Southern India.

Whether any such scheme can ever be carried into execution or not is a matter for future decision. For the present we can only observe carefully the progress of events, earnestly hoping that the close of a long history of painful suffering, of weary

waiting, and of impending ruin, may prove to be the commencement of a period of truer service and warmer zeal, of greater prosperity and wider influence, on the part of the Syrian Church, than she has ever yet known.

R. E. JOHNSTON.

ART. II.—THE PIONEER OF THE OVERLAND ROUTE.

THE movement for the erection of a national monument to Thomas Waghorn, Lieutenant R.N., has now assumed a definite shape. Set on foot by the Court Leet of Chatham, some months ago, it has very properly been made national. It is not only Chatham, his birthplace, but England, Europe, and the civilised kingdoms of the Eastern and the Western worlds that owe a debt of gratitude to the Pioneer of the Overland Route. M. de Lesseps has again and again acknowledged his indebtedness to Waghorn for the idea which resulted in the Suez Canal; and that one of our own countrymen should have discovered more than fifty years ago the importance of our possessing this speedier means of communication with India, instead of the long and tedious voyage round the Cape of Good Hope, is certainly a satisfactory fact; but it is by no means so satisfactory that there should have been so little national notice taken of it, until this indefatigable traveller has been thirty-four years in the grave. It is impossible to plead in satisfaction the Civil List Pension of £200 per annum, which was granted to him so grudgingly and tardily that he only lived to receive one quarter's payment. His widow, too, was allowed (since his pension died with him), in consideration of her husband's "eminent services," the annual bounty of £25, which was afterwards raised, in consequence of a public outcry, and because of her "extreme destitution," by another of £15; and the India House also gave her a pension of £50 per annum. True, his other relatives subsequently received pittances such as those which the bounty of the nation bestows in return for heroism and distinction, and which, by a curious rule of contrarieties, seem to vary inversely with the service rendered. Thus, upon his widow's death in 1856, his aged mother received a pension of £50, and this was upon her death increased to £75, which was divided amongst his three sisters. But that Thomas Waghorn, who saved both the national exchequer and the commercial communities of England millions, by opening up a new line of communication with the East, and many of

those dependent upon him, should have died in penury, is one of those hard facts of history which are at once very unpalatable and very true. It seems, however, that we are at last about to erect a national monument to him as one of the greatest explorers of the nineteenth century, while part of the fund that is being raised is to be devoted to the comforts of his surviving relations. Two of his sisters are still alive and in receipt of the munificent pension of £25 per annum apiece, and this has just been supplemented by the Government of Victoria by another grant of £52 a year each; and it would in many ways be satisfactory if the fund which is now being raised were devoted to their comfort, as a primary instead of a secondary object. It is only when we have wiped out this national reproach that we can fittingly honour the dead. At the same time it must be remembered that posthumous fame possesses a great charm for humanity; and if we look through the long line of heroes and scholars whose memories we now so dearly cherish, it is strange how few of them reaped the reward of their labours, and how many of them must have worked with the full knowledge that not till death would their worth be recognised.

Thomas Waghorn was born at Chatham early in 1800. Of his parents we know very little. His father was, however, a respectable tradesman, and held large contracts for the supply of the navy with meat, and though by no means a rich man, left a small fortune behind him. Thomas soon showed his capabilities. When twelve years old he entered the Royal Navy as a midshipman, and that "the boy is the father of the man," at any rate proved true in this instance, for before he was seventeen he passed in "navigation," both theoretical and practical, for lieutenant—being the youngest midshipman that had ever done so. But although this made him eligible to be gazetted lieutenant, many years were destined to elapse before he was raised to that rank, for at the end of the same year 1817, he was paid off. Shortly, if not immediately, after this he went to Calcutta as third mate of a trading vessel. India with its boundless wealth and immense capabilities seems to have had from the first the greatest fascination for him, for upon his return to England in 1819 he employed all the influence that he could command in procuring an appointment in the service of the East India Company, and was eventually successful in obtaining a berth in the Bengal Marine (Pilot Service) of India. This sphere satisfied him for some years, and the knowledge he acquired afterwards proved of immense service to him and his country. At the outbreak of the first Burmese war in 1824, at the request of the Bengal Government, he volunteered for active service, and received the command of

the East India Company's cutter *Matchless* and a division of gunboats. During the next two years he had plenty of fighting upon land and sea, and went through those terrible hardships off the pestilential coasts of Arracan which have for ever rendered that campaign, in spite of its successful issue in the Treaty of Yandaboo, mournfully memorable. More than three quarters of the force engaged fell victims to the "Arracan fever," many thousands of soldiers and sailors dying of that pestilence. Upon Waghorn's return to Calcutta after the conclusion of the war in 1827, with a constitution greatly undermined by fatigue and sickness, he received the thanks of the authorities. He had been through five engagements, and had been once badly wounded.

He now entered upon the labour of his life. Already he had discovered the vital importance of steam communication between our Eastern possessions and England, and at first he received some encouragement. Lord Combermere, then Vice-President in Council, gave him letters to the Directors of the East India Company in London, vouching for him "as a fit and proper person to open steam navigation with India, *viâ* the Cape of Good Hope." On his homeward voyage, Waghorn publicly advocated his views at Madras, the Mauritius, the Cape, and St. Helena, and on his arrival in England he lectured on the subject in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, and Birmingham, but made little way, because the Post Office and the East India Directors were opposed to ocean steam navigation. Waghorn expressed his views and put forth his qualifications for the enterprise in a pamphlet[1] which he addressed to the Court of Directors of the East India Company, and which was published in 1829.

In the preface to this *brochure* he says:

> It is not a pleasant thing for a man to speak of himself and his own qualifications; I shall therefore gladly leave this part of my subject to such testimonials of others as I have the comfort to possess, and which will be found in the following pages.
>
> Of myself, however, I trust I may be excused when I say, the highest object of my ambition has ever been an extensive usefulness; and my line of life—my turn of mind—my disposition long impelled me to give all my leisure and all my opportunities of observation to the introduction of steam-vessels between port and port in India, and to the consideration of the practicability of permanently establishing these as the means of communication between that territory and England, including all the colonies on the route. The vast importance of two or three months' earlier information to the Honourable Company, whether relative to a war or a peace, to abundant or to short crops, to the sickness or convalescence of a dis-

[1] "Steam Navigation to India by the Cape of Good Hope. Mr. Waghorn's (of the Bengal Pilot Service) Documents and Papers relative to Steam Communication with India by the Cape of Good Hope." London, 1829.

trict, and ofttimes of an individual ; the advantages to the merchant, by enabling him to regulate his supplies and orders according to circumstances and to demands ; the anxieties of thousands of my countrymen in India for accounts and *further* accounts of their parents, children, and friends at home ; the corresponding anxieties of those relations and friends in this country ; in a word, the speediest possible means of transit of letters to the tens of thousands who at all times in solitude await them, was a service to my mind, and it shall not be my fault if I do not, and for ever, establish it.

Then follow a series of certificates and testimonials couched in very flattering terms, a letter addressed by Waghorn to the subscribers of the Steam Navigation Fund at Calcutta, and reports of the meetings held at Madras and the Cape in furtherance of his project.

But although the Directors of the East India Company, with the exception of Mr. Loch, then Chairman, remained obdurate, in October, 1829, Waghorn received the encouragement of a special mission. Lord Ellenborough, the President of the India Board, commissioned him to go to India, through Egypt, with important despatches for Sir John Malcolm, Governor of Bombay, and charged with the supplementary duty of observing and reporting upon the practicability of the Red Sea navigation for the Overland Route. The journey was a most eventful one, and fortunately there is a record of it in Waghorn's own words.[1]

He left London on the evening of the 28th of October, 1829, or only four days after receiving his instructions, on the Eagle stage-coach, from the Spread Eagle in Gracechurch Street. Of foreign languages he now knew little, except Hindustani, which he found of some use to him on his arrival at the towns and cities bordering on the Red Sea, and this fact rendered his exploits all the more remarkable. His journey to Trieste was performed with unequalled speed, viz. in nine days, and the Foreign Office ordered an inquiry to be made into its stages. Further, he travelled *viâ* the Mount Cenis Road, because the road to Geneva, over the Simplon, was at this time much impeded by falling avalanches and broken bridges; while on arriving at Padua he found that he could not cross from Venice to Trieste by the steamer plying between them, in consequence of her being laid up for the repair of her machinery, and he then had to continue posting by the circuitous land-route of Codripo. These two circumstances lengthened the journey to Trieste by about 130 miles. After staying for three hours at Trieste he posted on to Pesano, through Capo D'Istria, and

[1] "Particulars of an Overland Journey from London to Bombay, by way of the Continent, Egypt, and the Red Sea. By Thomas Waghorn, of the Hon. East India Company's Pilot Service on the Bengal Establishment." London, 1831.

took a passage for Alexandria on a Spanish merchantman, which sailed in forty-eight hours after he boarded her. He arrived at Alexandria on the twenty-sixth day, but found, to his disappointment, on reaching Rosetta, where the agent of the East India Company lived, that nothing had been heard of the steamboat which was to meet him at Suez. In less than two days he set out for Cairo by way of the Nile, and in accordance with his instructions was careful to attend personally to the navigation of the Nile. The boat grounding on a shoal near Shallakan, he proceeded to Cairo by land. Here such an event as the arrival of an English courier bound for India created no little sensation. On the 5th of December he left Cairo on a camel for Suez, and on the journey took careful notes of the character and topography of the desert, which afterwards stood him in good stead. But the most adventurous part of his journey had yet to commence. Finding that the s.s. *Enterprise,* which had been commissioned to meet him at Suez, had not arrived, and, as the bearer of important Government despatches, feeling himself obliged to proceed at all hazards, he set out in an open boat to meet her. He gives the dimensions of this crazy craft as being forty feet in length, by eight in breadth. She carried one mast, and a crew of seven men. In this little vessel, without chart or compass, but steering by the sun by day and by the north star at night, he performed the voyage to Cossire, where he waited a week for the *Enterprise,* and then again set sail for Juddah. Here he fell in with one of the Company's cruisers, the *Benares,* and learnt that the steamer was not coming at all. This disappointment, coupled with his fatigue, brought on a serious illness, which delayed him here some weeks. When sufficiently recovered he took passage for Mocha in a native trading-vessel, but soon afterwards he found a Company's brig waiting to take him on to Bombay, where he arrived on the 21st of March, or four months and twenty-one days after leaving London, including all stoppages and detentions, which amounted, according to his estimate, to forty-two days.

But it was the result of this memorable journey, rather than the journey itself, that was destined to effect so much for mankind. Waghorn had now established the practicability of the Overland Route, and with characteristic promptitude he proceeded to follow up his advantage, reporting at length on the details of his scheme. With respect to the steamboat establishment, he named Ancona on the Adriatic as the best station. "All steamers which could carry fifteen days' coal would," he said, "be able to make Alexandria, a distance of 1,150 miles, in any state of wind and weather." He proposed that "the Ionian mails and those for Malta should be dropped at

Corfu, whence a branch steamer could ply to Malta. Thus Waghorn argued that a courier could reach Ancona from London in nine days, and would get to Alexandria from Ancona on the average in seven days; while the journey from Alexandria to Suez would take five days, and that from Suez to Bombay twenty-three days, or forty-six days from London to Bombay."

Armed with these facts and figures Waghorn returned to England, expecting to be received with open arms, especially at the India House; but his hopes were soon dashed to the ground, for he was curtly informed "that the East India Company required no steam to the East at all." He replied, "that feeling in India was most ardent for it; that large meetings held at Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta had declared enthusiastically for it; and that the Governor-General, Lord William Bentinck, was strongly in favour of the project." But in answer to all these protestations he was bluntly told to return to the Pilot Service or accept his dismissal; whereupon he at once sent in his resignation, and vowed that he would establish the Overland Route in spite of the India House. This action, of course, explains to some extent the harshness with which he was subsequently treated.

With characteristic energy he proceeded to Egypt, in order to put his plans into execution; but this time he not only had no official recommendation, but had "a sort of official stigma on his sanity." The Government nautical authorities, as he tells us, reported that the Red Sea was not navigable; and the East India Company's officers declared, that if it were navigable "the north-westers, peculiar to those latitudes, and the south-west monsoons, would swallow all steamers up! And, as if there were not enough to crush me," continues Waghorn, "in the eyes of foreigners and my own countrymen, documents were actually laid before Parliament showing that coals had cost the East India Company £20 per ton at Suez, and had taken *fifteen months* to get there."

Still, in spite of this overwhelming and incredible opposition, Waghorn succeeded in inducing Mehemet Ali to believe in and to help him. He began his new investigations by pointing out to the East India Company, that by taking coals to Alexandria, and thence up the Nile, and across the desert on camels, they could be got to Suez for less than £5 per ton, a hint of which the East India Company were not slow to avail themselves.[1]

---

[1] By 1846, when Lieutenant Waghorn was in a state of great destitution, the East India Company had saved more than three-quarters of a million sterling in this way alone.

With the scanty encouragement of permission from Mehemet Ali to open up the route, and the co-operation of the Bombay Steam Navigation Company, he was successful. He ultimately built eight halting-places in the desert between Cairo and Suez, and three comfortable hotels. He created a revolution in desert-travelling by establishing a service of English carriages, horses and vans, instead of camels; and by placing at first fast sailing-boats, and afterwards small English steamers, on the Nile and the Alexandria Canal. From 1831 to 1834 he worked the Overland mails to and from India, and in February of the latter year he carried through the mails from Bombay to London in forty-seven days, and that without using steam between Alexandria and London. In 1837 he opened an Overland Registry Office, and the occasion was signalized by the presentation of a handsome testimonial to him by the East India and China Association, and many houses connected with the commerce of the East.

Waghorn was peculiarly, if naturally, attached to Mehemet Ali, and was deeply interested in arguing that it was our interest and duty, as a nation, to aid in the civilization of Egypt, rather than by adhering to a line of policy which, while encouraging the extortionate demands of Turkey, tended to paralyze the efforts of Egypt towards the attainment of political freedom. Thus he says in one of his pamphlets:

"Eight years ago I felt convinced that that country (Egypt) ought to be the true road to India, and I maintained my principle in three quarters of the globe. I have travelled since then some hundreds of thousands of miles to disseminate my opinions, and I will never content myself till I find it the high-road to India. I am firmly convinced that Egypt is regenerating herself, and will resume her former station amongst the nations of the earth, and become as fruitful as she was in the time of the Pharaohs, and that, too, in ten years after English interests are fairly introduced."

Just now these views possess an adventitious interest.

But although he had originated and organized a route which was already revolutionizing the relations between the Western and the Eastern worlds, he was not destined to reap the fruit of his labours. Late in 1837 the Government took the whole mail system into their own hands, to the serious pecuniary loss of him who founded it. With the greatest courage he, as the head of "Waghorn and Co.," turned his attention to the conveyance of passengers and parcels. But the energy and enterprise of the man have never been rivalled, and seldom equalled. A couple of instances must suffice. On one occasion a steamer arrived at Suez with a broken piston, and would, in the ordinary course of things, have had to wait there until a piston arrived from England; but Waghorn immediately took measures to have one cast at Cairo—the first time that anything of the

kind had been attempted in the country—and the steamer was soon on her return voyage. Again, when the news of the capture of Ghuznee by Lord Keane arrived at Alexandria, there was no steamer to forward it, to the no small disappointment of the English residents there. Waghorn, however, who had the greatest influence with Mehemet Ali, and had access to him at all hours, procured the loan of his Highness's steamer, of which he took the command and piloted her to Malta. In 1842 he was made a Lieutenant R.N., and placed on the half-pay list. A pitiful distinction for such services as his! Other plans now engaged his attention. Thus he wrote an important letter to Mr. Gladstone respecting steam communication with Australia. He also explored a route through the Papal States *viâ* Ancona, and another by way of Genoa. In the winter of 1846-47 he was occupied by making experiments on the Trieste Route, and in six successive months, in spite of unparalleled and wholly unforeseen difficulties, he eclipsed, in five trials out of six, the long-organized arrangements of the French authorities on the Marseilles route, specially stimulated to all possible exertion, and supplied with unlimited means by M. Guizot. Here he was backed up partly by the Government, and partly by individuals who encouraged him to make the experiments, promising to indemnify him, but who afterwards disowned the contract, and sowed the seeds of his financial ruin by leaving him in debt to the tune of £2,000.

His experiments resulted in proving that all these routes were practicable should they ever be required; and the saving of thirteen days *viâ* Trieste over the old route *viâ* Marseilles, conclusively proved its superiority. But all his resources had been expended in these experiments and investigations, which he had carried out practically single-handed, and he now found himself overwhelmed with a load of debt. "Waghorn and Co." could not meet their liabilities, and the offices in Cornhill were closed. A parliamentary grant of £1,500, and a further gratuity of £200, were now given him by Lord John Russell. In this year, too (1846), a testimonial amounting to £3,000 was subscribed for him, the *Times* giving £200, while most of the other leading journals contributed handsomely. But all these sums were swallowed up by his debts.

He asked very pitifully for the payment in full of his debts, nearly all of which had been incurred in the public service. Ultimately, in consequence of various memorials and petitions, the India House awarded him a pension of £200 per annum, and the Government did the same; but they declined to pay his debts, and said that if he had made a bad bargain he must keep to it. He memorialized both his patrons. Such names as Lord Palmerston, Aberdeen, Ellenborough, Harrowby, Com-

bermere, Ripon, Sir John Hobhouse, Sir Robert Gordon, and Mr. Joseph Hume, testified to his deserving, but nothing more was done for him. The Government and the India House were as deaf now to his necessities as they had formerly been to his proposals and projects. The voice of the country now condemns unreservedly such national niggardliness, but it served its turn. With a constitution undermined by his constant and heroic exertions, with a heart broken by the wreck of his dearest hopes, and under the shadow of the awful fear which weighed him down, that "to the records and roll of the Insolvent Court would be added the story and name of the Pioneer of the Overland Route," he succumbed to circumstances, and died at Golden Square, Pentonville, early in January, 1850. He had then been in the receipt of his India House pension for about eighteen months; but of the Civil List pension he had only received one quarterly payment. We have already pointed out how his relatives have been treated by the country. Further comment is needless! But we must add, that it is doubtful whether figures could express the pecuniary gain to this country by means of the Overland Route. We have said enough to show why we should honour the memory of the great explorer, whose statue stands on Waghorn's Quay at Suez—a speaking monument of his services to civilization and commerce. And when we read the story of his life we are reminded once more of the well-worn, but immortal, words of the saddest of elegies:

> Can storied urn or animated bust,
> Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
> Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust,
> Or flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death?

W. Morris Colles.

Art. III.—THOUGHTS ON LITTLE THINGS.

Part II.

THE subject of little things connected with the musical part of our service proved so fruitful in suggestions, that it occupied our space entirely in a former paper. Let us pass on now to consider other matters connected with the worship of God in our churches, of equal, if not of greater, importance.

To begin with these services themselves. I think I am right in saying that it is now very generally admitted that our morning service, when conducted in the old-fashioned method, and

consisting really of three distinct services welded into one, is too long—indeed, much too long. I fully believe that this witness is true, and I would even go so far as to affirm my conviction that this unduly protracted service is a real source of weakness to our Church. It may be as well to give reasons for this strong conviction; and I will mention four. The first shall be one about which, I dare say, opinions will greatly differ. I can but state my own. I notice in many churches a disposition to curtail the *morning* sermon (in consequence of the length of the service), which is, I think, much to be deprecated, if, indeed, the morning sermon is what it ought to be. It is in our Sunday morning addresses that our pastoral work has mainly to be done. Then it is that we seek to "feed the flock of God," and it seems to me that he must be a very skilful feeder who can do his duty in this respect in less than thirty or thirty-five minutes. Morning sermons should be longer than evening ones, if these last are evangelizing, for it takes much less time to put the Gospel before the ungodly than it does to enter into the details of the spiritual life, or to illustrate the mysteries of Christian devotion. Careful exegesis of the passages considered, and practical elucidation of the doctrines or directions contained in them, our flocks have a right to expect at our hands, and good work of this kind requires time, both in preparation and in delivery.

But next, the long service would seem to be objectionable because there are few minds that can sustain their attention for so long a time, or keep their interest from flagging. There is no doubt or question about the very mischievous effect of an unduly long *extempore* effusion in a prayer-meeting; but is a protracted service less likely to produce an unwholesome effect just because it is Liturgical, and because the words are familiar? It seems to me that it might be difficult to show why we should not draw an exactly opposite conclusion.

But again, we have to consider the many young people who attend our churches, in whom a deep spirituality is not yet developed, and who therefore are specially liable to feelings of weariness and tedium. We have no business to inflict on those who are not fit to enter into it a prolonged religious function; and we have to consider, too, those who, though they are not young, are ignorant and unspiritual, who must needs have their place in the congregation until the harvest separation comes, and whom we encourage to attend in the hope that they may be led on to better things.

Two illustrations of the effect that our lengthy services actually have on such, may be offered here. On one occasion a little boy was asked by his mother to attend one of my week-day mission services. He looked very dubious for a few

moments, and then inquired, "If I do go, will they read that long thing about 'Good Lord, deliver us'?" Reassured on this point, he made no further difficulty. In the East of London a good friend of mine was pressing a woman to attend the church where he was going to preach, when he received the reply: "Well, you see, sir, it isn't the preaching that I mind, but it's *them preliminaries* that I can't do with. I really can't put up with *them!*"

If it be objected, are we to curtail the spiritual offerings of the devout, in order to meet the incapacities of the young and the ignorant and unspiritual? I reply that the devout have their own special function, from which others are excluded, and if they avail themselves of this as they should, their opportunities of public devotion will be ample, without their inflicting upon others a lengthened office which these are not in a condition to appreciate or enjoy.

But this brings me to my third and most important gravamen against our protracted morning service, namely, that it tends to exclude the Holy Communion from the proper position which it should hold in the system of Christian worship. When a point of theory or practice in religion is forced upon our notice from two opposite quarters, and is equally insisted upon by those who occupy severally the very poles of theological thought, it is surely high time that we should ask ourselves whether there is not probably something in it. If we find, upon further inquiry, that this view has been maintained by the Church Catholic, apparently throughout its entire history, and certainly seems to derive a *primâ facie* support from various utterances of Scripture, we shall scarcely be justified in declining to acquiesce in it.

Now we have the witness of Romans, Greeks, extreme Anglicans, and others of that class, on the one side, and the witness of Plymouth Brethren on the other, to the fact that the celebration of the Holy Communion is the central act of Christian worship, around which all other acts should cluster according to their own proper degree of importance. Both classes alike teach us that disciples of the Lord should come together on the first day of the week "to break bread," whatever else they do or leave undone.

But is this the view of the Holy Communion taken by ordinary Evangelical Churchmen? Is it not rather regarded as a special supplemental service, quite distinct from the ordinary forms of Christian worship, and therefore one to be only occasionally participated in? Now my contention is, that the customary arrangement of our morning service tends to foster this view of the case. When we have been already for nearly two hours engaged in religious exercises, we

are scarcely in a position to enjoy and fully enter into the service of a third hour. We have already attended *the* Church Service; only occasionally can it be expected of us that we should attend an *additional* service of a special character. Thus the sorrowful sight is presented of multitudes of Christian (*really* Christian) people turning their backs on the Table of their Lord, and leaving His feast untasted, perhaps four Sundays out of five, without the slightest feeling of regret or compunction. It is quite the natural or customary thing to do, and nothing else is looked for.

This feeling is strengthened by the custom, which I regret to find still prevalent in some churches, of making a formal conclusion of the Morning Service by pronouncing "The Grace," or some kind of benediction, after the sermon, or after the prayer for the Church Militant. This is usually followed by a voluntary on the organ, as if the clergy wished to say to their flock, "Now the principal service is over, and you may go your way; but if any of you *do happen* to wish to remain to *an extra* service, you can do so!" Is this the way to train our people to assign this Holy Ordinance its proper place?

Nor are we very much helped in this respect by our early Communions, very useful and desirable as they are. For being held at an unusual hour, and generally only attended by some of the most zealous and earnest-minded, they do not seem to show that this is the central act of Church worship. Rather such special gatherings seem to favour the idea that the Holy Communion is a supplemental service that may be thrust into any convenient corner, so as to make way for the greater function of the day, the regular gathering of "the great congregation."

It is not the object of this paper to point out possible improvements in the Prayer Book, or in the arrangement of the services in the Liturgy; but I cannot help expressing my regret that it is not permitted to us to proceed straight from the *Jubilate* to the Communion Service, thus avoiding the needless and almost absurd repetition of Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Collect.

I know of one church where this "use" is observed by a vicar who acts upon the principle, "*de minimis non curat lex*," and who thinks that intelligent worship is a more important thing than the niceties of rubrical observation. In that congregation the Holy Communion is looked upon as *the* service of the Church. The morning service up to the *Jubilate* forms an introduction to it, and this, with the Ante-Communion service, which immediately follows the *Jubilate*, will not occupy more than three-quarters of an hour. While the Nicene Creed is being sung, the preacher ascends the pulpit, and if he preach

for half an hour, there still remain three-quarters of an hour for the celebration of the Holy Communion, without the limit of two hours, which would seem to be a reasonable one, being exceeded. And what is the consequence? That vicar has often told me that he never presses his people to come to Holy Communion; he simply spreads the feast before them, and leaves it to their spiritual appetite to bring them to it. Yet I doubt whether there is another church in England where the proportion of communicants to attendants is so large. And yet the congregation is mainly composed of poor or humble folk, who, as a rule, are least disposed to participate in this ordinance as a matter of form and decency. I think I am right in saying that from 600 to 700 have been known to communicate there in a single day, while the church only seats about 900 to 1,000.

Until the day arrives when our authorities, whoever they be (and that seems *the* question), can see their way to some such adjustment of our services, I have high Episcopal authority for saying that there is nothing to prevent our passing from the hymn after the Third Collect directly to the Ante-Communion Service, provided the Litany be read at another time. This involves a somewhat irrational repetition of the Lord's Prayer and Collect; but as this has to be submitted to in any case, it need not weigh against the proposal. If it be thought desirable that the Litany should sometimes be read at morning prayer, an opportunity would be offered on those Sundays in which an early morning or an evening celebration occurs; and on such occasions the Ante-Communion Service might be omitted after the Litany, so as to avoid undue lengthiness.

It may be pointed out that the subject-matter of the prayers after the Third Collect is dealt with by the prayer for the Church militant, so that little or nothing would be lost in this respect by the change.

Let us now pass on to that service of which I have spoken as the central act in Christian worship, the Liturgical accompaniments of which in our own Church are so singularly well chosen and impressive that they seem from first to last a continuous inspiration. Does it not offer a sad indication of the spiritual condition of our churches that the introduction of this service is usually signalized by the formal withdrawal from the scene of those who in other offices act as the leaders of the praise of the congregation? That the younger members of the choir who are not yet confirmed should withdraw is only right and proper; but that a whole surpliced choir should, acting as a choir in its official capacity, formally head the exodus of the Lord's people from the Lord's House, where He

is spreading the feast for His disciples, does seem as strange as it is sad.

But we have got so accustomed to this, that it does not seem to us at all an anomaly that music should be wholly banished from our Eucharistic "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," although it was only at the institution of this feast that we hear of a hymn being *sung* by the Master and His disciples. They manage things better in America, where, I believe, every Churchman who can sing at all can sing the *Gloria*. The music they have set to it is but a poor composition in my judgment, but little worthy of the words to which it is arranged: it is simple, however, and it is universally known, and those are great merits. Will not some of our many Church-musicians try to produce a *Sanctus* and a *Gloria* that all may sing, and feel, while they sing it, that the music helps their hearts to adore? Might we not hope for something sufficiently popular and sufficiently classical from the gifted composer of "Christ and His Soldiers"?

At such a solemn service we must all feel that distraction is specially to be deprecated; and the least desirable of all distractions surely are those which recall to our minds the divisions and party strifes and distinctions of a very contentious period. Is it not, then, a pity that we cannot arrive at something like uniformity of practice in some of the most impressive parts of the service? Yet I have hardly ever, in all my wanderings, visited a church in which all the communicants adopted the same modes of procedure. At the short exhortation I observe that some stand while others kneel. At the *Sanctus* some insist on joining in the opening words, "Therefore with angels," etc.; while others with marked emphasis, as if they were performing an act of protest as much as of worship, strike in at the "Tris-hagion." Some receive with crossed palms, and some seem to make equally a point of grasping with the fingers. This is perhaps a matter in which variation of practice is not so objectionable, because it in no way interferes with the feelings of your fellow-worshippers. But it is otherwise with regard to the uncertainty that seems to prevail as to the proper attitude to be assumed at the *Gloria*. It surely must be a distraction when one finds one's self standing when all around are kneeling, or kneeling when all around are standing. Perhaps if we sang our *Sanctus* we might arrive at uniformity, so far as it is concerned, for no well-instructed Church-composer would think of beginning his music earlier than the "Tris-hagion;" and perhaps, too, the very act of singing our *Gloria* might dispose us to rise to our feet, though whether this is the preferable attitude is open to discussion.

It is desirable, and it would become more desirable still if

the numbers of our communicants were what they should be, that the administration should not be unnecessarily protracted. I have witnessed, as may be supposed, a considerable variety of usage in this part of the service, and have formed definite conclusions upon some points. I observe that not a few Evangelical clergymen repeat the appointed words to a whole railful of communicants. Inasmuch as such a mode of procedure is out of keeping with the individuality which seems specially aimed at in the words spoken, it would seem reasonable to conclude that this method is only adopted in order to save time. It is, however, my firm conviction that, unless under very exceptionably favourable circumstances, this idea is a delusion. The time that is lost in approaching and withdrawing from the Holy Table, when some forty or fifty persons are all in motion together in opposite directions, is a great set-off against whatever time may be gained by the non-repetition of the words. And besides this, it must be borne in mind that none are receiving while the words are being (usually solemnly and slowly) uttered. If there be two clergymen officiating, I am persuaded that less than half the time is occupied when the words are said to two communicants at a time, and when those who have received immediately retire and are succeeded by others. And even when one only officiates, no time will be lost. It is difficult to see why there should be any objection to administering to two persons while the words are being repeated. The words, even if uttered in a very low tone, are equally audible to both; and by this very slight modification of the regular usage, the time occupied in administration is reduced by one half, and there is this clear gain to the administrator, that he has to repeat the words only half as often. None but clergymen can know how difficult it is to avoid becoming mechanical in the repetition of these words, which our service must always render necessary. To minimize this danger, without sacrificing the sympathetic effect induced by addressing the individual as an individual, should certainly be our object; and by adopting the course I have indicated—the course, I mean, of administering to two or even more persons while the words are being uttered—this object would seem to be gained.

It should be remembered, however, if this method be adopted, that a most unseemly and painfully distracting effect is produced if the clergy engaged in the administration speak above their breath. The words are addressed to the individual, not to the congregation; and when this is forgotten, the effect of say four loud voices all speaking together, is scarcely to be outdone by the extravagance of a "Ranters'" prayer-meeting.

There has been, as we all know, a good deal of acrimonious

discussion as to the position of the celebrant during the consecration prayer. As a mere matter of order and decency the process of dragging all the sacred vessels over to the extreme end of the Holy Table, does not seem to commend itself to one's feelings. If the Eastward position be supposed to symbolize doctrines that Evangelical theology condemns, would it not be possible, while still standing before the Holy Table, to turn right round and perform the act of consecration, looking towards, and therefore certainly "in the presence of," the people? It seems to me that this practice (adopted by the venerable incumbent of the church I have already referred to) tends to make the solemn act of commemoration much more impressive. Such a marked change of attitude particularly well becomes the act by which, according to St. Paul, we *preach* the Lord's death until His coming again.

But here it occurs to me to point out, that although Evangelical clergymen are not unfrequently credited with Zwinglian views, and although they certainly are strong upon the commemorative aspects of the Eucharist, it is by no means an unfrequent thing to find the accessories of this ordinance so arranged as to render the commemorative act all but impossible. Am I wrong in saying that, as a matter of fact, in a very large number of Evangelical churches the bread is never broken at all? Again and again I have had to officiate in churches where the sacramental bread being all cut up into small pieces, it was impossible to do more than break one very small piece such as would be administered to one individual; and when this is the "use," I very much question where the symbolical act ever, as a rule, takes place at all. Certainly it does not so take place as to appeal by its eloquent symbolism to the hearts of the spectators. Surely this ought not to be!

Another little matter connected with the administration of the Holy Communion seems to me of very considerable importance. I notice in many Evangelical churches that but little advantage *seems* to be taken of the time that must necessarily elapse, where there are many communicants, before or after communication. In churches that bear the name of "High" this is otherwise, and this seems to me one of many little things in which "Low" might do well to learn of "High." It goes to my heart when I hear, the moment the last minister has communicated, a bustle all over the church as of people rising from their knees to their seats. It seems to me that if there is one time more than another in which we ought to be able to pray, and thankful for an opportunity of praying, it is then, when we are being brought so near to a great blessing, and when the enjoyment of that blessing depends so much upon our spiritual attitude and condition. And here seems to be the justifica-

tion of the method of administration ordained in our Church which might otherwise be justly censured as needlessly and even tediously protracted. These precious moments of spiritual communion with the Master of the feast are the best possible preparation for our sacramental communion, where listlessness, distraction, or loss of a devotional attitude of soul must needs mean a loss of the special benefit of the occasion.

But there are other things about which I want to speak, and lest space should fail me I will waste no words in apologies for being discursive. It is indeed impossible to be anything else when one has to touch upon so many details. We have been approaching the Penetralia of the Christian temple; let us now withdraw to the outer court—verily the court of the Gentiles, if you will! Believing, as I firmly do, that "pews" were never invented in heaven, wherever else the idea of them may have originated, I will not enter upon a discussion which is still far from closed, but simply admit that there are grave difficulties in the way of their wholesale abolition, though some of us may regard that as a consummation devoutly to be desired. But, if it be necessary for the sake of domestic considerations that certain pews should be set apart for the use of certain households, does it follow that these should be looked upon as if they were the private property of the persons to whom they are assigned? What can be more monstrous than the spectacle that may be witnessed any day in numerous West-End churches, where it is an understood thing that "strangers" remain patiently standing in the aisles until some arbitrarily selected point in the service is reached, when they may regard themselves as free to scramble for a seat. Surely it is nothing short of an indecency that such interruptions of the quietude and order of Divine service should be not only permitted but actually ordained, and that by the officers of order, the Church-wardens.

Such a spectacle would be a barbarism even in a Pagan temple or in a Moslem mosque, but in a Christian church it is worse—it is an outrage upon the first principles of our faith, and a downright sin. Surely it is time that all right-feeling people should demand in the name of mere Christian decency that our churches, and every part of them, shall be free to all from the moment the organ voluntary begins; and it would be well if it could also be arranged that this should begin two or three minutes at least before the appointed time of service. If people cannot find their way into church in good time, let them put up with what accommodation they may get, whatsoever they pay for their seats; but to arrange for the interruption of the service of God, in order to suit man's indolence or carelessness, is a refinement of man-pleasing that one cannot think of without indignation and shame.

But here is another view of the case. Have sextons, beadles and pew-openers souls, or are they automata incapable of discharging any functions of worship? If we answer the first of these questions as I suppose we all shall, then does it not follow that things should be so arranged as to remind them of the fact, instead of an inference to the contrary being constantly suggested to their minds? If these unfortunate persons are kept constantly "on the move" for the benefit of other people till about the beginning of the Litany, it is not very likely that they will be in a frame of mind for worship. Indeed, it will be difficult for them to avoid a sort of impression that the service is not intended for them. Indeed, when one considers their case, it is not difficult to understand the feelings of the author of recent advertisements having reference to another class of officials who are equally kept working while others are worshipping: "Wanted, two strong men to blow a large organ—*Heathen preferred.*" Clearly, however, the labours and distractions of these officials might be greatly diminished, if indeed their services were not rendered altogether superfluous, were the very simple and obvious arrangement which I have suggested generally carried out, and were all seats in every church known to be free as soon as the organ began to play.

I have noticed with satisfaction in not a few churches that I have visited, that there is a disposition to disestablish these functionaries altogether, so far as this can be done with due regard to "vested interests," and from some churches they have already disappeared, and no one regrets them. I hope that this class of officials may soon share the fate of the antique bespectacled and bewigged parish clerk of cherished "three-decker" memories, and that the defunct species may ere long find its place in the Museum of Ecclesiastical Curiosities.

Passing on to other things, it may be observed that we have heard perhaps a little too much of late about the "Ornaments Rubric;" but, while authorities in matters ecclesiastical are fighting over it, might it not be as well if all would remember that certainly our ornaments ought to be *ornamental*. I wish that the charge of slovenliness, so often brought by innovators against those who follow more old-fashioned ways, were altogether devoid of foundation. What amazing surplices have I beheld in my wanderings, and how little credit did they do to the laundress! (no fault of hers, poor thing!) Stoles I have seen that looked as if they had been rent off the skirt of some old and discarded silk gown, and some hoods so faded that it was dangerous to guess at their Academical significance. If we still must indulge in the black gown (to my mind a very superfluous piece of Ritualism), is it too much to demand that it shall at least be black, and not brown or green with antiquity?

These are all very small matters indeed, yet they have their significance. A gentleman is expected to wear clean linen and a coat that has not altogether lost its colour. He will usually have a respectable-looking carpet on his drawing-room floor, and a cloth that is not hopelessly faded on his table. Does it not then seem to argue some want of proper respect for the decencies of religion when we find everything otherwise in church? Do not the faded cloth, the thread-bare carpet, the ragged surplice, the shapeless stole, the ancient hood, all seem to say, anything is good enough for the service of God?

But it is time we should pass from the ornaments of our clergy to consider what more personally concerns them. I often wonder how much longer we are to go on without any attempt being made by our Bishops to teach aspirants to clerical dignity to *read!* It is expected by these dignitaries of our Church that those who present themselves for ordination shall know a good deal about all sorts of antiquated heresies that prevailed in the third and fourth centuries, but are not very likely to trouble us in the nineteenth. It is expected, rightly enough, that they should know a little Greek, and less Latin; but two things, that you would suppose to be absolutely necessary to the proper exercise of the ministerial functions, are never, so far as I am aware, insisted upon at all. The one is logic, and the other is elocution. On the importance of the first of these qualifications I will not now enlarge, as it does not belong to my subject; I will only say in passing that it is my firm conviction that a good course of John Stuart Mill would be found much more useful in these days, to a candidate for holy orders, than an equally severe training in St. Augustine or any of the fathers, either of antiquity or of the Anglican Church.

But with respect to elocution, is it not too obvious to require demonstration that failure here must put a man at disadvantage all through his ministry, whatever his gifts in other respects may be. I meet with but few really good readers in my wanderings, and, alas! with a considerable number of clergymen who can only be called bad ones. I have a young man now before my eye whose reading always reminds me of the springing of a policeman's rattle. It would seem as if "When the wicked man," etc., had been compressed within his lips, like steam pressing against a safety-valve, during the last few notes of the organ; and then, as the pedal-note booms out a sonorous finale, the pent-up words rush forth in a way that brings the congregation to their feet with a start. But from this alarming outburst to the "evermore" at the end of the Grace, the good man betrays not the slightest sign of any sort of feeling whatever; it is simply one monotonous and unmiti-

gated rattle all the way through. Why does he do it? Well, I think I know. His Incumbent is the victim of an opposite fault, and the young man is, no doubt, under the influence of reaction. His soul resents, I dare say, the practice of his ecclesiastical superior, which is to accentuate every second or third word, and it is hard to say which of the two methods one likes least. Another I heard not long ago whose very unmusical sing-song was none the less so regular in its cadences that it would almost have been possible to express it in musical characters. Another, though free from affectation, is harsh and apparently devoid of heart and sympathy; another mumbles hopelessly; and yet another mouths his words in the most unnatural fashion, while another seems to regard it as either devotional or impressive to adopt a method of pronunciation that, to say the least of it, is abnormal. We want a professor of elocution, and one who understands his work too, at each of our Universities, backed by a rigid determination on the part of our Bishops to receive no candidate who has not passed under such instruction.

One other matter, and one only, will I venture to refer to ere I bring my remarks to a close. I have ventured to affirm that, in these party days, "Low" may learn a good deal from "High;" but is there not also a possibility that the former may be induced by the subtle and scarcely detected influence of the latter, to abandon some practices and customs which used to distinguish the best and most spiritual of the Evangelical fathers? I confess that I notice with unfeigned regret that the custom of extempore prayer, either before or after the sermon, is falling into general disuse. Much as I value our grand old Liturgy, it seems to me that it leaves ample scope for the pouring out of the heart in special supplications appropriate to the particular subject of the sermon. Is there not a danger of our binding ourselves afresh with grave-clothes when our fathers established a precedent of Christian liberty? and may not respect for the niceties of rubrical observance become a mischievous hobby, and be ridden to death? But if any are troubled with rubrical scrupulosity—a troublesome disease that might be called "the reds," and is scarcely more desirable than "the blues"—it may be pointed out that we put ourselves perfectly in order if we give the ascription after instead of before our extemporary prayer, for then, obviously, the prayer is ecclesiastically included in the sermon. None could object to an address to the Divine Being in the course of or at the end of the sermon; and if, while this is delivered, all kneel, surely the change of attitude could never be a matter for ecclesiastical censure. But the time is gone by for old-world rubrical stiffness; we have more important things to think

about, and whatever tends to increase the usefulness and deepen the spirituality of our ministry, should be jealously guarded and fully made use of.

I have "said my say." To many of my readers it may seem that space and time might better have been occupied with the weightier matters of the law or of the Gospel. It may be so; yet if, as the result of these lines of friendly criticism, some few dead flies, or even some microscopic animalculæ, be taken out of that ointment of spikenard, very precious, which from year to year the Church, from her broken box of alabaster, should pour at her Master's feet, they will not have been written in vain. Nor let us forget the lesson of one of our children's hymns:

Little drops of water,
Little grains of sand,
Make the mighty ocean,
Make the boundless land.

W. Hay Aitken.

Art. IV.—RELIGION UNDER THE STUARTS.

History of England, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War. By Samuel R. Gardiner, LL.D., etc., etc. In Ten Volumes. London: Longmans, 1884.

THE publication by Mr. Gardiner, "in a connected form, of the works which have been the labour of twenty years," puts the public within easy reach of a very valuable history of the times of the early Stuart Kings. Mr. Gardiner's patient researches have probably almost exhausted the materials available for the period, though he tells us that material is constantly accumulating, and that he has been obliged almost to rewrite the first portion of the book. General readers will, we think, be fully satisfied with the evidence of a complete examination of the sources of history which the book exhibits. Their complaints, if they have any to make, will probably be of another character. They will perhaps find themselves sometimes bewildered among the multiplicity of details, and the difficulty of detecting the principle of arrangement, and following the thread of the history. We do not propose in this article to attempt any survey of the general history contained in Mr. Gardiner's volumes. Our object simply is to extract from them such facts and statements as may serve to give some sort of picture of the religious life which had to be lived under the earlier Stuarts.

That during the latter years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth there was a strong reaction in favour of the Church is freely admitted by Mr. Gardiner (vol. i. p. 38). Strange to say, however, at the same time that he admits this, he is very severe on the conduct and character of the man to whom, more than any other, it was certainly due, viz., Archbishop Whitgift. He makes the assertion that to aid Whitgift in what he considers his persecuting course, the Court of High Commission was called into existence (vol. i. p. 34), and that this court, as administered by him, was something altogether different from the Courts of High Commission which had been at work previously. We are unable to discover any essential difference. The three articles put by Whitgift to the clergy were all grounded on statute law; and that strict discipline was required at the moment no one really conversant with the state of the Elizabethan Church can deny. We have not been able to find anything either in Mr. Gardiner or elsewhere to make us doubt Fuller's assertion that Archbishop Whitgift was "one of the worthiest men that ever the English hierarchy did enjoy." Burghley found fault with his discipline, it is true; but were Burghley's hands clear from the spoliation of the Church? and was it not Whitgift's gallant defence of Church property, even to the Queen herself, which made Burghley and Walsingham fume? Whitgift was content with bare subscription to his articles, as articles of peace. Bancroft went beyond this, and forced the clergy to declare that they heartily approved of that which they were accepting. This was, perhaps, an unjustifiable invasion of the domain of conscience, and many of those who had previously subscribed could not bring themselves to do so again, under the circumstances. But can any sane man contend that some test of conformity was not necessary at that time? It is easy to talk about "concessions" and "comprehensions," or the policy of "loving your enemies and hating your friends;" but history is written in vain if it does not teach us the absolute futility of sacrificing principle to expediency. We are more at one with Mr. Gardiner when he speaks of the only rational solution of the difficulties raised by conflicting opinions—a solution little understood, unhappily, in those days:

> A system in which an established Church is surrounded by independent tolerated Churches may not be ideally perfect, and even in England it is not likely to hold its own for ever. But it was the only solution of the problem fitted for the seventeenth century when once Bacon's solution had been rejected. It gave to the national religion, in a new way, that combination of organization with individual liberty which Bacon had seen to be indispensable. In the development of their religious liberty the Catholics, little as they knew it, were even more deeply interested than the Puritans. Only when the two parties which divided Protestant

England, were pacified, either by peaceful union or peaceful separation, would they feel themselves strong enough to tolerate an enemy so formidable as the Church of Rome. (Vol. i. p.253.)

Of these happy days there was not then much apparent prospect. The Romanists (Mr. Gardiner persistently calls them *Catholics*) were subjected to intolerable hardships and persecutions. There can be no doubt that James had led them to believe that their condition would be greatly benefited if they acquiesced peaceably in his accession. He bribed their quiescence, and then made their condition worse than before. In the year 1605, "in different parts of England, 5,560 were convicted of recusancy." This by law involved the forfeiture of two-thirds of their lands. Many escaped this by bribing the King's Scottish followers; but a considerable number had to pay the forfeiture. Arrears in fines, which had been allowed to accumulate in the late reign, were now demanded. The rich were obliged to pay £20 a month. The goods and chattels of those who were in arrear were seized. Even the menials of the Court were allowed to prey upon these unfortunate "victims." "The profits of the lands of two recusants were granted to a footman, and this was by no means an isolated case" (vol. i. p. 230).

A very graphic and interesting account of the Gunpowder Plot is given by Mr. Gardiner. He points out well how great a share in bringing it on and supporting it the horrible doctrine of Equivocation, as taught by the Jesuits of those days, had. It is well known that Garnet's life might probably have been spared but for this:

Garnet was again examined several times after his conviction, and there may possibly have been some inclination on the part of the King to save his life. But the Jesuitical doctrine on the subject of truth and falsehood, which he openly professed, was enough to ruin any man. He not only justified the use of falsehood by a prisoner when defending himself, on the ground that the magistrate had no right to require him to accuse himself, but he held the far more immoral doctrine of equivocation. According to this doctrine the immorality of a lie did not consist in the deception practised on the person who was deceived, but in the difference between the words uttered and the intended meaning of the speaker. If, therefore, the speaker could put any sense, however extravagant, upon the words of which he made use, he might lawfully deceive the hearer, without taking any account of the fact that he would be certain to attach some other and more probable meaning to the words. (Vol. i. p. 281.)

Those who held and advocated such monstrous sentiments as this did, as it were, court persecution. Garnet added (though this is not quoted by Mr. Gardiner), "In cases of lawful equivocation, the speech by equivocation being saved from a lie, the same speech may without perjury be confirmed by an oath, or by any other usual way, though it were by receiving the sacra-

ment." The condition of the Romanists in the earlier years of the reign of James was indeed miserable, and for this they had chiefly themselves to thank. Then in this era of inconsistencies the whole condition of things is changed, and during the latter part of the reign Parliament is complaining open-mouthed of the favour shown to Romanists by king and judges.

We have called this the "era of inconsistencies," and we believe that no general term would better describe the character of the reign of James I. It is a period very difficult for the historian, as there are scarce any guiding threads running through it, except, perhaps, the increasing unpopularity of the King, and the growing importance of the middle class. What Mr. Gardiner seems to us to have done for the period is to have provided a large and valuable mass of materials, and to have thrown light on many difficult and obscure points. It would be too much to expect that he should make everything plain and simple—that, with the very best desire to represent him favourably, he should be able to exhibit James as a consistent and able ruler; or to clear away the cloud which will for ever rest on the fame of the great Bacon (vol. iv. chap. xxxiv.). What thorough knowledge and lucid and sympathetic statement may do for history is well exhibited in Mr. Gardiner's thirty-sixth chapter, giving the account of the voyage of the *Mayflower*, and the settlement at New Plymouth. Bancroft's enforcement of conformity was not accompanied, as it should have been, by the toleration of the worship of the dissidents. It is true that in the days of James separatists were not followed up with the unrelenting rigour which they afterwards experienced under Laud. But they were always at least in danger of fine and imprisonment, and could not meet together safely for common worship. The Brownists, the earliest of the separatists, had made their way to Holland. Here, however, peace did not go with them. "The self-assertion and independence of character which had made them separatists not unfrequently degenerated into an opinionativeness which augured ill for the peace of the community" (vol. iv. p. 145). Johnson, one of their leading ministers, incurred great odium from the fact that his wife had her clothes fashionably cut, and would insist upon wearing cork heels to her shoes. To these elements, already disturbed, there came in 1606 a new factor of disorder. John Smith, a separatist minister, who had got together a congregation at Gainsborough, emigrated with them to Holland, and immediately began to quarrel with Johnson. "He had adopted Baptist opinions, so far, at least, as to assert the necessity of the rebaptism of adults. Not being able, however, to satisfy himself as to the proper quarter to apply for the administration of the

rite, he finally solved the difficulty by baptizing himself. He was not one in whose neighbourhood peace was likely to be found" (vol. iv. p. 146). This good man was generally known, as Heylin tells us, as a "Se-Baptist." A congregation of a more sedate and devout character had been formed at Scrooby under two ejected ministers, Clifton and Robinson. These men, finding the difficulties and dangers of their position too much for them, decided to follow the others into Holland. After great obstacles surmounted they found themselves in Amsterdam. "But even at Amsterdam there was no rest for them. The little Church there was still distracted by disputes, and it was not for a love of theological polemics that they had left their homes. Smith and Johnson might quarrel as much as they pleased; but as for themselves, they had come to Holland in search of peace; and if peace was not to be found at Amsterdam, it must be sought elsewhere" (vol. iv. p. 151). Accordingly they soon moved to Leyden. Yet here they were not at ease. "They had come to Holland to keep themselves separate from the world. Were they sure they had succeeded?" On the contrary, the rigid elders found their congregations drifting fast into "worldliness." To escape this, they formed the design of emigrating bodily to the New World, that they might escape dangerous surroundings. Very much in the same spirit the monk or the nun seeks the cloister. But—

Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret.

From this project, after wonderful obstacles and difficulties, grew the voyage of the *Mayflower* and the settlement of the "Pilgrim Fathers." The story is admirably told by Mr. Gardiner, and with the fullest sympathy for the religious feelings of the emigrants. A little knowledge of the after-life of these good people may perhaps serve a good deal to qualify this sympathy. In their persecutions of one another, their whippings and brandings, and even murders, they rivalled, if they did not exceed, their English persecutors.

That not alone for Romanists and Puritans, but also for Churchmen, the reign of James must have been a very wretched and trying time, is abundantly evident. It was, as we have said above, the "era of inconsistencies." At one time the King was Calvinist, at another he was Arminian. At one time he favoured the Protestant interest, at another the Romanist. The clergy were never sure how their utterances in his presence, or of which he might be informed, would be received. In 1616 the King sent strict orders to Oxford for the repression of Calvinism. In 1617 Mr. Sympson, preaching before him and advocating Arminian views, was censured, and forced to recant. Nearly at the same time Dr. Mocket, warden

of All Souls, having written a book in which Calvinism was supported, was punished by the burning of his book, while poor Mr. Peacham, Rector of Hinton St. George, was tortured and condemned to death for sentiments found in a sermon in his study, which had never been preached.[1]

Interference with opinion of the most vexatious kind prevailed. The famous Selden was forced to recant his argument about "Tithes" in a most abject manner; while Mr. Knight, a young Oxford divine who had advocated the doctrine taught by Paræus, that subjects might in certain cases take arms against their sovereign, was summoned before the Council and committed to the Gatehouse, where he remained two years (vol. iv. p. 297).

When James was approximating to the Spanish alliance, absolute and Romanist views were in favour. Throughout the country there was uneasiness and fear. The most lively dread existed of the hated religion of the Spaniard, and the strongest measures were used to coerce public opinion. "A servant to Mr. Byng, a lawyer, was stretched on the rack for saying that there would be a rebellion, and 'a simple fellow' was condemned to a traitor's death for declaring that, though he was ready to spill his blood for the King if he maintained religion, he would be the first to cut his throat if he failed therein" (vol. iv. p. 296). Dr. Everard was committed to the Gatehouse for speaking against the Spaniards in a sermon. Mr. Clayton was sent to prison for "reproducing Coke's scurrilous allusion to the introduction of the scab by sheep imported from Spain." Dr. Sheldon "was thought lucky to have escaped with a reprimand for some harsh reflections upon the people who worshipped the beast and his image" (vol. iv. p. 347).

The Archbishop was ordered to issue directions to preachers not to handle controversial topics. This was intended as a support to the High Church and Arminian School then coming into vogue. But, as Mr. Gardiner well points out, the greatest injury that could be done to them was to enable them to silence their opponents by force:

> The great battle of the sixteenth century had been waged between Catholicism and Protestantism. The great battle of the seventeenth century, as yet felt rather than understood, was to be waged on behalf of mental and personal liberty. Unfortunately it lay in the King's power to decide whether the Arminians should range themselves, on the whole, on the side of the advancing or the retrograde party amongst their country-

[1] In this sermon the writer questioned the right of the King to exact from the clergy a "Benevolence" or extra-legal contribution; the Convocation having been dissolved before voting the usual Clerical Supply, and the King endeavouring to use this plan of "benevolence" in lieu thereof.

men. Laud disputing with a Jesuit or a Calvinist, was a true Protestant, a genuine successor, according to the altered conditions of the age, of Luther and Knox. Laud entrusted with power to silence his opponents, to forbid the study of books which he considered objectionable, and to restrain the preaching of sermons which he held to be mischievous, would be upon the side of the Jesuits and the Pope. It was thus that James's efforts at repression resulted, against his will, in giving new life to Puritanism. It gained the alliance of many a man who had no sympathy with the narrowness of its tenets, but who found in the lofty and noble spirit with which it was pervaded, the strength which could enable him to shake off the weight which pressed so heavily upon the energies of the nation. (Vol. iv. p. 348.)

We cannot follow Mr. Gardiner through the minute account which he gives of the Spanish match negotiations and the Prince's visit to Spain. The story is well told, but it is one that is insufferably tedious. Of the character of James I., the historical estimate is much more favourable than that usually accorded to him. It is but just to ascribe to James I., he writes, a desire to see justice done to all, to direct his subjects in the ways of peace and concord, and to prevent religion from being used as a cloak for polemical bitterness and hatred:

But he had too little tact, and too unbounded confidence in his own not inconsiderable powers, to make a successful ruler, whilst his constitutional incapacity for taking trouble in thought or action, gave him up as an easy prey to the passing feelings of the hour, or to the persuasion of others who were less enlightened or less disinterested than himself. His own ideas were usually shrewd, and it is something to say of him that if they had been realized, England and Europe would have been in a far better condition than they were. Keenness of insight into the fluctuating conditions of success, and firmness of will to contend against difficulties in his path, were not amongst the qualities of James. (Vol. v. p. 315.)

We think this estimate considerably too favourable; but, at any rate, it may be said of James that he was a better King than the far worthier man who succeeded him. Mr. Gardiner's remarks on Charles's character show considerable insight. "Conscious of the purity of his own motives, he never ceased to divide mankind into two simple classes—into those who agreed with him, and those who did not—into sheep to be cherished, and goats to be rejected. Such narrowness of view was no guarantee for fixedness of purpose. When the moment came at last for the realities of life to break through the artificial atmosphere in which he had been living, when forms unknown and unimagined before crowded on his bewildered vision, it was too late to gain knowledge the acquisition of which had been so long deferred, or to exercise that strength of will which is only to be found where there is intelligent perception of the danger to be faced." The historian also offers some able explanations of that crying defect in the character of Charles—his want of sincerity. "When he entered into an engagement he either formed no clear conception

of the circumstances under which he would be called upon to fulfil it, or he remembered too clearly this or that consideration which would render his promise illusory, or would at least, if it had been spoken out, have prevented those with whom he was dealing from accepting his word. When the time came for him to fulfil an engagement, he could think of nothing but the limitations with which he had surrounded it, or with which he fancied he had surrounded it, when his word had been given. Sometimes he went still further, apparently thinking that it was lawful to use deception against those who had no right to know the truth (vol. v. p. 318).

As regards the prospects of religion, they were decidedly better under the new King than under James. There would be no more inconsistencies. Charles was fixed and earnest in his religious opinions. He was also devout, and little inclined to listen to loose stories and jocular remarks during sermon-time, as his father had been. Immediately on the accession of Charles, the dispute between Calvinism and Arminianism broke out more fiercely than ever. The occasion of this was the publication of Mr. Montagu's books. Parliament, inclined to Puritanism and Calvinism, and full of hatred to Rome, connected the Arminian opinions with Rome, and assailed them with extraordinary virulence. We think Mr. Gardiner sees more of reality in this notion than really exists. At all events the King would not yield. Montagu was protected, and ultimately became a Bishop. But this cost Charles an immense amount of popularity, and the religious policy which he from henceforth adopted, of entertaining as much bigotry to the Arminian side as the Parliament entertained towards the Calvinistical, was a fruitful and growing source of trouble to him. The Arminian divines, gratified by the favour of the King, and seeing nothing but bitter hostility in the Parliament, speedily became the advocates of the absolute rule of the monarch as against the claims of the legislature. The most extravagant doctrines were preached by obsequious clergy. Dr. Sibthorp maintained that it was the King's right to make the laws and impose taxes as he pleased. Dr. Wren argued that the proper way to show the fear of God was by fearing the King. "Unless you will be slaves and rebels, you will fear God and the King alike." Dr. Mainwaring claimed that "Kings were above all; inferior to none, to no man, to no multitude of men, to no angel, to no order of angels. Their power is not merely human, but superhuman. To the King is communicated all power; of dominion over the states and persons, and of jurisdiction over the deeds and actions of mortal men." This became the actual religion of these men. It was eagerly accepted by Charles, and promoted in every way by Laud, who

saw in the exaggerated prerogative of the King, both civil and ecclesiastical, a way, as he thought, of working salutary reforms in the Church. Hence the policy of Laud becomes almost wholly Erastian. There is no action whatever of the Church as such. It is the King's prerogative, wielded by ecclesiastical hands, which is made to enforce everything, whether it be a declaration as to how the Articles are to be interpreted, or a body of canons for the Church in Scotland.

We have no intention of entering upon the oft-repeated story of Laud's attempts to enforce conformity, and the hardships of the Puritanical clergy. We do not perceive that Mr. Gardiner has added anything of importance to the facts already well known; but with the candid spirit which distinguishes him, he has given the Archbishop fair play, and treated him very differently from some other historical writers who have gained credit for impartiality. We observe that Mr. Gardiner advances in candour and gentleness as his work goes on. The treatment of Laud in vol. vii. is very different from that which is accorded to Whitgift and Bancroft in vol. i. The more, indeed, that these times are studied, the more do we perceive that allowance is to be made for all parties. There was much of good as well as a considerable amount of wrong-headedness both in the Laudian and the Puritan. There was much to teach us that "The Church would never remain united unless its rulers knew how to conciliate moderate opponents. They would have to conciliate others also whose minds were cast in a different mould. They would have to find room by the side of Gouge and Sibbes for Nicholas Ferrar and George Herbert" (vol. vii. p. 262).

And if this period is fruitful in lessons of toleration, so is it also conspicuously important in the history of our theology. To it the rise of the three great schools of thought, which continue to this day to group under them almost all the clergy of the English Church, may be distinctly traced. Our readers will perhaps pardon us for sketching this somewhat more at length. The peculiar position of the English Church, after the breach between her and the Church of Rome established at the Reformation, forced the cultivation and practice of controversial writing upon her chief divines. Being assailed, they were forced to defend their position, and it must be acknowledged that they did it with great vigour and success. But when the position of the Anglican Church towards the Roman had been cleared and established by such works as Jewel's "Apology" and others, there arose a new class of assailants on the other side, against whose attacks Anglican divines had to contend. And these assailants were more difficult to meet than the Romanist writers; for not only did they carry with them

popular sympathy, but the subjects on which controversies with them turned seemed in their nature trivial, and such as might well be neglected or conceded in the face of dangers threatening from the other side. Happily our great divines did not take this plausible view, which if adopted would have speedily resulted in the loss of the continuity of the English Church, but defended against the Puritans the principles of Church government, the value of the Sacraments, and the externals of worship, with the same vigour and force which they displayed against the Romanists on the other side. It is sufficient to mention the able and pungent treatises of Bancroft, Whitgift, Cooper, and Bilson, and especially the monumental work of Richard Hooker, to show the strong position held by the Church as against the Puritans at the end of the sixteenth century.

But controversy, as these divines well knew, is not the highest work of a Christian theologian: it is rather his misfortune than his deliberate choice. And thus, when the first fervour of the attacks on both sides had abated, and the position of the Anglican Church had been strengthened, English theologians began to turn their attention to constructive and expository work, rather than to heated skirmishing with opponents. This is the main character of Hooker's great work, which is only controversial accidentally, but in substance constructive.[1] From about this date (1609) may be dated the rise of what is called the Anglo-Catholic school, the principles of which involved a revolt from the authority of the divines of the Foreign Reformed Communions, and an appeal to the judgment of the early Fathers, and the practice of the primitive Church; and of these views and of this spirit, the most prominent and able exponent in the reigns of James and Charles I. was Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester. He was the first to take a direct stand against the teaching of Calvin. He went further than Hooker, who had maintained that Episcopacy was permissible and salutary, and claimed it to be of divine right. He gave great prominence to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist as distinct from the receptive view; but he differed altogether from Archbishop Laud in his view as to the relations of cere-

[1] This is also the character of a work, nearly as great as Hooker's, but much less known, namely, Field "Of the Church." In his dedication, Dean Field, says, "That all men may know that we have not separated from the ancient Faith, nor forsaken the fellowship of the Catholic Church, but that we have forsaken a part to hold communion with the whole, I resolved to communicate to others what I had privately long since for my own satisfaction observed, touching the nature of the Church, the notes whereby it may be known, and the privileges appertaining to it."

monials to orthodoxy or good living, and he was not prepared to enforce them at the heavy cost of alienation and bitterness. "This I can affirm," says Fuller, "that wheresoever he was a parson, dean, or bishop, he never troubled parish, college, or diocese with pressing other ceremonies upon them than those he found before his coming thither." Andrewes was a controversialist against Rome, as most of the divines of his day were; but his chief strength lay in his sermons, published after his death by Laud and Buckeridge, and which, in spite of the extraordinary quaintnesses which disfigure them, are a perfect mine of theological learning. "The world wanted learning," says one of his contemporaries, "to know how learned this man was." As one of the most influential of the translators of the Bible, and as the constant friend of the learned foreigners who came to England, such as Isaac Casaubon and Hugo Grotius, his reputation for learning was, however, extensive. His great fault was an excessive subserviency to the King, which led him to take an unworthy part in the matter of the divorce of Lady Essex; but he behaved admirably when Archbishop Abbot got into trouble about the accidental killing of a gamekeeper, and by his great authority and learning succeeded in destroying the pretence set up by some of the Bishops that the Archbishop had contracted *irregularity* by the accident, and could not thenceforth perform aright his Episcopal functions.

Andrewes may be regarded as the founder of the Anglo-Catholic school; but there were other divines of that period nearly, if not quite, equal to Andrewes in learning, who wrote from somewhat of a different standpoint. Of these, the most conspicuous were Joseph Mede, Bishop Hall, and Bishop Usher. Of these, Mede is most distinguished for his work on the Revelations, and his interpretations of prophecy; Hall, for his practical and devotional writings, sermons, reflections, and contemplations; Usher, for his profound knowledge of obscure antiquities. These divines, while they quoted the Fathers, and showed deference to the decisions of Councils, yet allowed also authority to the moderns, and did not disregard the voice of the foreign Reformers. They dwelt much upon the doctrine of an Invisible Church existing within the bosom of the Visible Church, which they regarded as the subject of the promises made to the Church; and they held that the verifying faculty in the interpretation of Scripture, and the settlement of disputed points, was to be found in the spiritual guidance of the understanding of the faithful. They may be classed as the *Scriptural* school of writers, as distinguished from the school of Andrewes, Laud, and Cosin, which we may describe as the *Patristic* school.

But this period was to witness the rise of another school of

divines, which has perhaps had as much influence on the theology of the Church of England as either of the two former. This may be described as the *Rationalistic* or Latitudinarian school, of which the founders were John Hales and William Chillingworth. Hales was a man of great talent and learning. He was a Fellow of Eton, and lived a very secluded life. His writings, which have been preserved, only amount to a small collection of sermons and a short tract on schism, which is principally remarkable for the earnest attempt made by Archbishop Laud to prevent its publication. In spite, however, of the Archbishop, it got into print, and we can easily understand why Laud was so anxious to repress it. The author begins by saying that heresy and schism are two theological scare-crows, used for frighting away persons from making inquiry into opinions. Schism is a maintaining and using a rival communion and worship, or the insisting on such terms of communion as involve separation. In this case, it is the *imposing authority* which is guilty of schism, not those who separate; "for," says the writer, "when either false or uncertain conclusions are obtruded for truth, and acts either unlawful or ministering just scruple are required of us to be performed, in these cases consent were conspiracy, and open contestation is not faction or schism, but due Christian animosity." He refers the decision of what is necessary to man's own judgment rightly instructed. He repudiates altogether the appeal to antiquity. But schism is in most cases unnecessary, for in Hales's view a Christian may worship indifferently with any religious body. "For all public meetings pretending holiness, so there be nothing done but what true devotion and piety brook, why may I not be present in them, and use communion with them? Nay, what if those to whom the public service is committed do something either unseemly or suspicious, yet for all this may we not separate, except we be constrained personally to bear a part in them ourselves." He thinks that a Trinitarian may attend an Arian service, but in order to avoid schism, he would have public services cleared of everything save those things in which all Christians agree. What those are he does not tell us. Hales's argument, therefore, while it justifies separation on principle, is yet mainly directed to removing the causes of it on Latitudinarian principles.

It is unnecessary to state at length Chillingworth's argument in his great work "The Religion of Protestants." As proving the contradictory against Romanism, and as destructive of the notion of an infallible Church, it is simply perfect and unanswerable; but as a constructive treatise, it will be judged differently. It is directly opposed to those two great schools of English theology which we have already sketched; to the

Patristic school, which adopts ancient writings, traditions, and decrees, as interpreters of Scripture; to the *Scriptural* school, which believes in a direct teaching as to the meaning of Scripture to be conveyed to the mind of the devout reader by the operations of the Holy Spirit. He advocates the Rationalistic view, or truth discoverable from Scripture by each man for himself by fair inquiry, and, like his friend John Hales, he held opinions and doctrines to be matters indifferent, and not grounds of separation. Of a somewhat kindred view with these divines was a layman whose writings attracted great attention at this period, Sir Thomas Browne, the Norwich physician. In beautiful English, rivalling that of Chillingworth or Bacon, Browne advocated toleration on Latitudinarian principles. We thus have in the midst of the strictest discipline and most rigid book-examination of Laud, the birth and development of the extremest Latitudinarian principles. Many were attracted to these opinions by their liberality and seeming reasonableness. It was reserved for a famous divine of the Church of England to show the true relation between a creed firmly held and zealously guarded, and the just treatment of the opinions of others. In a well-known passage in "His Liberty of Prophesying," Jeremy Taylor says, "Although variety of opinions be impossible to be cured, and they who attempted it did like him who claps his shoulder to the ground to prevent an earthquake, yet the inconveniences arising from it might possibly be cured, not *by uniting their beliefs*—that was to be despaired of—but by curing that which caused these mischiefs and accidental inconveniences of their disagreeings." Towards reaching this good end, we think Mr. Gardiner's History may contribute not a little. The fair and candid spirit which pervades it, together with the exhaustive research which will recommend it to all historical students, are both of the highest value.

GEORGE G. PERRY.

ART. V.—A JOURNEY UP THE RIVER CONGO.

The River Congo, from its Mouth to Bólóbó; with a General Description of the Natural History and Anthropology of its Western Basin. By H. H. JOHNSTON, F.Z.S., F.R.G.S. With maps and illustrations. Sampson Low and Co. 1884.

ATTENTION has of late in many ways been directed to the Congo, or Livingstone river, particularly in regard to the enterprise of Mr. Stanley; and a well-written narrative of a journey up that great river is just now welcome. Mr. Johnston's

book is not a record of novel exploration, for he visited few places that were not already explored, nor of scientific research, for in his own estimate he lacks the necessary ability; but it is a successful attempt to give an interesting description of the landscapes, and inhabitants, and natural history of a region of which, after all, we know very little. For intending travellers the work may serve as a "guide-book," scientific readers will also find in it a good deal of information; and for the class of general readers there are many attractions. The descriptive passages as a rule are graphic, and there are pleasing illustrations, so that it is easy enough to obtain, from pen and pencil sketches, a clear impression of the main features of the much-talked-of Congo region. To earnest supporters of Missionary work the book will be disappointing.

Banana Point is a little peninsula of sand, which on one side is lashed by the breakers of the Atlantic, and on the other meets the brunt of the mighty Congo. Banana is the only good and safe harbour at the river mouth, and it will therefore become an important settlement. Here are three different factories, of which that belonging to the Dutch Company is by far the largest, with its thirty white employés, and some four hundred natives, Kruboys, Krumanas, and Kabindas. From Banana Mr. Johnston started to ascend the river in a Dutch steamer, making his first halt at Kissangé, a small trading settlement about twenty miles from the sea. He stayed here "three most pleasant weeks, enjoying the kind hospitality of Senhor Ribeiro at the Dutch Factory." Of the vegetation of Kissangé he writes in glowing terms. For instance:

> In the marshy spots, down near the river shore, are masses of that splendid orchid, *Lissochilus giganteus*, a terrestrial species that shoots up often to the height of six feet from the ground, bearing such a head of red mauve, golden-centred blossoms as scarcely any flower in the world can equal for beauty and delicacy of form. These orchids, with their light green, spear-like leaves, and their tall swaying flower-stalks, grow in groups of forty and fifty together, often reflected in the shallow pools of stagnant water round their bases, and filling up the foreground of the high purple green forest with a blaze of tender peach-like colour, upon which I should have thought no European could gaze unmoved. Yet the Portuguese merchants who lived among this loveliness scarcely regarded it.

In a little village near Kissangé, it seems, are kept every possible kind of mammal, bird, or reptile, captured and tamed to be sold in the English steamers, or to merchants at Banana. In neatly-made wicker-work cages, constructed out of the light pretty wood of the baobab, are green parrots, wax-bills, and weaver birds; in one cottage are young mandrils and a lemur; in another are barbets with red foreheads and large notched bills.

At Boma, eighty miles from the mouth of the river, are

"factories" belonging to the English, Dutch, French, Portuguese, and Belgians. There is also, says our author, "a flourishing Catholic Mission here." Boma is reckoned the most unhealthy place on the Congo. The heat is excessive, and behind the European houses lie great swamps and fetid marshes, which not only give rise to much fever, but breed mosquitoes, terrible for bloodthirstiness and size. Crocodiles here are numerous and daring. Thirty miles higher up is Underhill, the site of a large Baptist Mission. Underhill (known to the natives as Tundua) is a pretty station, in splendid scenery. Opposite the station, the great river takes a broad bend and is shut in on both sides by the towering hills, so that it resembles a beautiful mountain lake lying in a profound gorge, save for the signs of the whirling, racing current. The little mission-house at Underhill was building when Mr. Johnston arrived there. The principal element in its construction, as in most of the temporary houses on the lower Congo, was what the Portuguese call "bordâo" and the English "bamboos:" the strong shafts of the full-grown fronds of *Phœnix spinosa*, a species of dwarf palm. The skeleton of the house is first formed by a scaffolding of stout poles cut from among the saplings of the neighbouring forest.

From Underhill, in a little steamer belonging to the African International Association, Mr. Johnston made his way to Vivi, where Mr. Stanley, who had just returned from Europe, was then staying. On the night of his arrival, twenty-seven white men dined together in the moonlight on the edge of the cliff, the station dining-room being too small for the company. From "Stanley's House," on Vivi Hill, there is a most beautiful view of the Lower Congo, with its woody islands, its swirling rapids, and noble downs. Below the "white" part of Vivi, lie the settlements of the Zanzibaris, the Krumen and the Kabindas. These are "scrupulosly clean." No work is done on Sundays.

Mr. Johnston made a short trip to the interesting native town of Pallaballa.. As he journeyed among the natives several came forward and saluted him with "'Morning," a contraction of "Good-morning," which they have learnt from the Missionaries. The Missionary of the Livingstone Inland Mission, who was resident at Pallaballa, gave the traveller a kind reception, and a welcome meal was soon prepared for him by the Missionary's orders. There were delicious fried bananas, pounded pea-nut sauce with roast chicken, "palm-oil chop," and many other native dishes, supplemented with a few European accessories. After dinner, Mr. Johnston attended prayers with the Missionary in the school-house, where an English lady, one of the members of the Mission, was residing.

Here [he writes] some twenty people were assembled, principally boys. There was a little giggling at our approach, otherwise they were well behaved. The Missionary prayed in Fiote (the language of the Lower Congo), and in English, and also read a chapter of the Bible in the same tongues. The subject in Fiote was not wisely chosen, being a wearisome record of Jewish wars, where familiar-sounding Bible names were strangely mixed up with unintelligible Fiote. All the while the black congregation (swelled this evening by my five porters) sat stolidly unmoved, although the Missionary strove to infuse as much interest as possible into his discourse. After this followed a Moody and Sankey hymn in Fiote, in which I felt anything but at home, and could only make semblance with my lips to be following. Finally, a short prayer finished up the whole, and then began a ceremony which the natives would not miss for the world. Each one came separately and shook hands with the lady, the Missionary and myself, accompanying the shake-hands with a "Goo'-night, sir," applied indifferently to either sex. We also retired to our rooms, and although mine was rather damp (there was a fine crop of mushrooms—alas! not edible—and waving grass growing on my bedroom floor), I had a comfortable bed, and slept well.

At Pallaballa, at the time of Mr. Johnston's visit, the natives were disposed to be impudent, and even aggressive, towards white men; but during the last few months of his stay on the Congo, they modified their tone, owing to their commercial relations with Mr. Stanley's expedition. They are very superstitious, and for every person that dies somebody is made "ndokki" (or "devil-possessed"), and has to take the *casca* poison. This is usually administered in such a way as to be merely a strong emetic, under the idea that the victim may "bring up" the devil, and cast him out with his bile. They think a great deal of their "*Nkimba*," and on the south bank of the river, where Mr. Stanley's influence is not as yet so firmly established as in the neighbourhood of Vivi, it is dangerous for a white man to offend these fanatics, who will severely beat him (as they did a young member of the Livingstone Mission) with their long wands or staves in return for fancied slights.[1] Mr. Johnston writes:

The people of Pallaballa may be said to "patronize" Christianity, a religion which, in my opinion, they are in their present mental condition totally unfitted to understand. When the Missionary holds a Sunday service in King Kongo-Mpaka's house, some twenty or thirty idlers look in, in a genial way, to see what is going on, much as we might be present at any of their ceremonies. They behave very well, and imitate, with that exact mimicry which only the negro possesses, all our gestures and actions, so that a hasty observer would conclude they were really touched by the service. They kneel down with an abandon of devotion, clasp their hands and say "Amen" with a deep ventral enthusiasm. The missionary, on the occasion that I accompanied him, gave a short sermon in Fiote, well expressed considering the little time he had been studying the language. The king constantly took up the end of some phrase, and repeated it

[1] The *Nkimba* are the initiated. They may be of any age, boys of eleven, or men of forty; but generally the "Nkimbaship" is undergone by young men. The sacred mysterious language is never taught to females.

with patronizing interest after the missionary, just to show how he was attending, throwing meanwhile a furtive glance at his wives, who were not pursuing their avocations outside with sufficient diligence. A short prayer concluded the service, and when the king rose from his knees, he promptly demanded the loan of a handscrew to effect some alteration in his new canoe.

Of Missionary labour Mr. Johnston shows but little appreciation. The negro can only be ruled by gentle force, and the long-suffering Missionaries are the worst people possible to deal with him. A "rule of love," indeed, he takes for a confession of weakness, and abuses it accordingly. So writes Mr. Johnston. In Pallaballa, where the Livingstone Missionaries "have been patiently working for three years," the king insisted on a present of gin to the value of 25s., the interpreter being Mr. Johnston's "kind host," who had frequently been obliged to make "presents" himself. All this has been altered. Missionaries and travellers alike now, it seems, are free from exactions, treaties having been made by Mr. Stanley's agents with the native rulers. One thing is certain. The "rule" of many white traders among the "niggers" is not a "rule of love." On the Lower Congo, says our author, slavery certainly exists, as much as ever it did, the only difference being that it is internal; and slavery will continue to exist, he adds, "as long as European merchants stand sorely in need of labour, and native chiefs are willing to 'apprentice' or sell their superfluous subjects for an important consideration in gin, cloth or guns. Any traveller who visits the factories on the Lower Congo—except, perhaps, in those belonging to the English—may see groups of slaves in chains who are so punished for having run away, and if he arrives at a time when a slave has just been recaptured—possibly by his own relatives, who have brought him cheerfully back, sure of a reward—he will have an opportunity of studying the application of the formidable cow-hide whips to the runaway's skin, and see the blood spirt from his well-flogged back." Certainly, Christian people will admire the Missionary's "rule" more than the Trader's.

In January, 1883, Mr. Johnston, with sixteen porters, left Vivi for Isangila, Manyanga, and Stanley Pool. He was escorted by three of Mr. Stanley's favourite Zanzibaris, of whose "affectionate service" he makes due mention. Part of his journey he made in a little steam launch, since transferred to the upper river. Manyanga, it seems, was the scene of the only serious disturbance which took place between the expedition of Mr. Stanley and the natives; the buildings are now entrenched and fortified. The station of the Baptist Mission, at a lower level than the fort, is very bright and pretty, but not so healthy; a Missionary lately died of dysentery. Manyanga is a great food-centre; at its markets, troops of sheep, fifty goats, eighty

fowls, and hundreds of eggs may be bought at one time. Navigation of the river here ceases. The great falls of Ntomba Mataka are close to the station; and in order to reach Stanley Pool, about 100 miles, the traveller must follow the native roads.

When quite close to Léopoldville, which, like nearly all the "Expedition" stations, is placed on rising ground, you get a glimpse of Stanley Pool, with its lovely islands; and on turning the hillside the magnificent prospect of it bursts upon your view. From the little station of the Baptist Mission, on the top of the hill, a view embraces almost the whole extent of the Pool, which is about 25 miles long and 16 broad. The Baptist Missionaries, it seems, have a large garden down near the banks of the river; they rent altogether from the Expedition about two acres and a half of land, paying for it £10 per annum rent. In the wooded valley below Léopoldville the Livingstone Inland Mission finished building their houses last year, Dr. Sims and a Danish Missionary being in charge. Léopoldville, our author thinks, will become the great Empire city, the terminus of a railway from the coast, and the starting-point of a river journey half across Africa.

In the narrative of his boat journey to Bólóbó occur many interesting passages; but our limits are overpassed. Here and there in his descriptions of the people of the Congo appears a sentence (*e.g.*, in pp. 416-418) which, in a book for general readers, is a mistake. In his Darwinism the author is far advanced. From a great struggle, *e.g.*, he says, "some one of the many great apes emerged as man"!

ART. VI.—JOHN STAUPITZ.

THERE are few who know anything of the life of the great German Reformer, who do not know that he was more or less aided in his spiritual difficulties, at the outset of his noble career, by the old monk whose name stands at the head of this paper. But their knowledge of Staupitz may be of the vaguest kind, consisting of little more than the impression that he was helpful to Luther in directing him to Christ for salvation. For such readers we furnish the present brief paper, in the hope that they may be induced to pursue the subject further. It will be found not only profoundly interesting, but highly valuable as an historical study, inasmuch as the relation of Staupitz to Luther seems to be an important factor among the combined elements which led to the reformation of the Church.

John Staupitz, sprung from an old and noble family in

Saxony, of Sclavonian extraction, as is indicated by the concluding syllable of his name—*itz*—was born about the middle of the fifteenth century. Du Pin speaks of him as related to, and a friend of, the house of Saxe. There is little known of his childhood, except that from an early age he was fond of reading and study. It was his delight to go apart from his youthful companions, and in some quiet retreat pore over whatever books came in his way. And to encourage this bent of his mind, and give himself wholly to a studious and contemplative life, he entered the Augustinian Order. In those days the Scholastic philosophy founded upon Aristotle's method of argument grew to a most extravagant degree of favour, and formed the chief object of study in most of the existing Universities. Staupitz made himself acquainted with all the subtleties of Scholasticism—philosophical and theological—and took with high approbation and honour his degree of Doctor of Divinity at Tubingen, in the same University where Melancthon in after-days attained such distinction. After some time, however, he discovered, like so many others before and since, that philosophy could not satisfy the yearning of his heart after spiritual truth and peace; and he turned to the sacred Scriptures, and while he read and meditated on the Divine Word, light shone upon his mind, and with it peace came into his heart. God became His own interpreter. "The entrance of Thy word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple." "Great peace have they that love Thy law." Staupitz now saw and confessed that knowledge alone cannot make the theologian. The words of St. Paul found an echo in his soul, and sounded there till he closed his eyes in death. "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." He learned that with knowledge there must be faith and love—a sentiment somewhat similar to that afterwards expressed by Luther: "Pectus est quod Theologum fecit." "Knowledge puffeth up." Knowledge alone tends to puff up its possessor, to distend him with self-arrogance, to blow him into a conspicuous bubble full of moral emptiness and of intellectual vanity. Tennyson well says:

> What is she, cut from love and faith,
> But some wild Pallas from the brain
> Of Demons? . . . . .
> . . . . Let her know her place;
> She is the second, not the first.

In the year 1503, the chapter at Eschwege elected Staupitz General Vicar; in 1511 he became Provincial of Thuringia and Saxony, and in the following year he attended the Lateran

Council, at Rome, as the representative of the Archbishop of Salzburg. It was on this occasion he heard, as Seckendorf relates, of the prophecy of a Franciscan monk, that a hermit would one day attack the Papacy. This he at first understood as meaning an actual hermit, but when Luther (who is well known to have belonged to the order of Augustinian monks) arose, and commenced his great crusade against the errors of Rome, he recognised with surprise that Luther was the hermit, and mentioned to him the circumstance. This anecdote reminds us of the prediction said to have been uttered before his judges by John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer. In allusion to his own name, which signifies a goose, Huss says, "This day ye roast a goose, but a hundred years hence a white swan will come, which ye will never be able to put to death." The stories at least show how wide-spread was the expectation that the Papacy would soon encounter a vigorous onslaught.

Staupitz so commended himself to his superiors that he was soon raised to a higher post. He "purchased to himself," by his earnestness, diligence, and wise oversight of his charge, the "good degree," that *βαθμὸν*, "standing," of which the Apostle speaks, and in 1515 he became General Vicar of the Augustinian Order over all Germany. In this commanding and responsible situation, he earned by his talents, eloquence, and prepossessing external appearance, the special confidence of his prince, the Elector, Frederick the Wise, who consulted him on various matters, and employed him with great success in embassies to different courts. Luther used to say of him: "That was a great man, not merely learned and eloquent in schools and churches, but also beloved and highly honoured at courts and by the great. He had a powerful intellect, an honest, upright and noble disposition, without meanness and without servility." To the same effect is the testimony of the Jesuit Maimbourg as quoted by Seckendorf: "He was an able man, of great dignity, diligent, eloquent, of a handsome personal appearance, and highly esteemed by Frederick, Duke of Saxony, who often sought his advice." There is a story told of him which shows with what ease and presence of mind he behaved in the highest circles. In preaching a sermon one day, he had occasion to quote the genealogy of Christ, as given by St. Matthew, and stumbled at some of the princes of the tribe of Judah. The Princes of Saxony, who had been to church, invited the preacher to dinner, when Duke John said: "Doctor, what was the matter with the Gospel to-day?" To which Staupitz replied, "Most gracious Prince! in my text to-day I had three kinds of men to deal with. First, patriarchs, who were easy to manage; then kings, about whom it was possible to speak. But when I came to princes, I found them quite different.

They were very ill to handle and confused me in my discourse." To which the Elector added with a smile, "Brother, if you wish to ask any more questions, Staupitz will be ready to answer you."

In the discharge of his duties as superintendent of the Augustinian Brotherhood in Germany, Staupitz showed great zeal. But his position was very difficult to fill, in consequence of the indolence, knavery, avarice, and licentiousness of many of the monks. Everywhere a general laxity of morals showed itself, and his work seems to have given the Vicar-General very little real satisfaction. Few of the brethren were like-minded with himself. The founder of the Order might have said, as the great founder of the Benedictines is represented as saying to Dante, when, under the guidance of Beatrice, the poet had ascended to his presence in the seventh heaven:

> My rule
> Is left a profitless stain upon the leaves;
> The walls, for abbeys reared, turned into dens:
> The cowls, to sacks choked up with musty meal.
> Foul usury doth not more lift itself
> Against God's pleasure, than that fruit which makes
> The hearts of monks so wanton.

"During the first three years," Staupitz once remarked, "I wished to govern according to strict justice, but things would not proceed in that way. Then, according to the rules and counsels of my predecessors, which also had no success. In the third place, according to the will of God, and with constant prayer to Him; but as little did this answer. At last, in despair of all other plans, I did what I could." He used to say when he could not find men after his own heart to fill the monastic offices: "We must plough with the horses we have, and he who has none must yoke his oxen." To those who possessed the true Christian spirit, and sought to live a holy life, he was most helpful, treating them with great kindness and love. Indeed, the most charming characteristic of his official life was the deep interest he took in such persons, especially in the younger members of the brotherhood. He was a true father to them—"Guide, philosopher, and friend:" he directed, encouraged, and aided them in their studies; warned them of the subtlety and malice of the Evil one; counselled them to watchfulness and prayer; and above all, sought to direct their thought and trust to Jesus. "Believe that He is the Son of God," he says, "and never doubt; or desire at least to believe steadfastly in Him, and thereby thou art blessed in Him." But his labours, except with a few, afforded the good Vicar little encouragement. He had more success in his efforts, under the Elector, to found the University of Wittenberg, with which are imperishably associ-

ated the renowned names of Luther, Melancthon, Carolstadt, and other leading spirits of the Reformation. This college, destined to become so great an intellectual force in the advancement of spiritual religion throughout Germany and the world, was established in 1502. In founding it, the Elector acted chiefly on the advice of Staupitz, who became the first Dean of the theological faculty. This office required him to foster the study of theology, and in this way he was brought into intimate connection with Luther.

It was at Erfurt that they first became acquainted with each other. In making a visitation of the monastery, Staupitz observed a young brother whose whole aspect bore traces of severe inward conflict and rigid discipline; yet, under the veil of this anguish and struggle, he could see there was a great and ardent spirit. At once the heart of the Superior was drawn to the young monk. This was Luther, then under deep conviction of sin, and longing for peace and salvation. He made known his doubts to Staupitz, told him of his troubled conscience, and sought advice and comfort at his hands. The good Vicar-General entered kindly into the feelings of Luther, and directed his mind from self-tormenting thoughts to the Cross of Christ. "Dear Martin," he said, "you do not know how useful and necessary this trial may be to you. It has come from God, and He does not thus exercise you for nothing. You will one day see that He will use you for great purposes." And with such like words he stilled the agitated heart of the young brother. He sent him to Christ, "the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;" he made known to him the way of salvation through the atonement; he urged him to seek for light in the sacred Scriptures—and light came, comfort came, peace came. Staupitz, in fact, did for Luther what Ambrose did long before for Augustine, whom he weaned from Manicheism; and what long afterwards John Newton did for Thomas Scott, whom he delivered from the coils of a dreary Socinianisn. And now, by a careful and constant study of the Word of God, and by earnest prayer for the grace of the Holy Spirit, the young monk was gradually led to see the falsehood of the Romish theory of salvation. The unsatisfying nature of monkish legalism became clear to him, and heart and soul he subscribed to the great doctrine of St. Paul, that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law"—a doctrine which he embraced with more and more ardour and persuasion of its truth every day to the close of his life. "The just shall live by faith." This was the key of all his after-teaching, and the principle of his life. With eager enthusiasm he now gave himself up to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and the

writings, more especially, of Augustine, Bernard, and the German mystics, until at length he was regarded as the most learned man of his Order in Germany. And when it was proposed, in 1508, to complete the plan of theological education at Wittenberg, Staupitz remembered his young friend at Erfurt, —now twenty-six years of age—and called him as a fellow-labourer to his side, appointing him, in the first instance, Professor of Philosophy, but hoping soon to see him enter the more fruitful field of theology. Accordingly, four years after, Luther was made Doctor in Divinity; and from that time to the end of his life he devoted his great talents to the sacred office. THE CHURCHMAN has lately well told us what Luther became, and what he did; how he shook the Papacy to its centre; how he restored the great doctrine of justification by faith to its right place in the theological system; how he gave the Word of God to his countrymen in their own language; how he vindicated, in opposition to a conventional formalism, the eternal necessity of spiritual religion, as alone acceptable to God and profitable for man!

The sale of indulgences, as everyone is aware, led to Luther's first attack upon the Romish Church. And in this attack he was helped by Staupitz. Indeed, the latter is said by some to have been the first to enter the field. He, too, from the high spiritual vantage-ground which he occupied, perceived the scandalous character of this moral trafficking in souls. And he strongly complained to the Elector of the abuses which took place in connection with Tetzel's venal mission, and then put forward the young and vigorous Luther to carry on and prosecute the strife. Like Luther himself, he was opposed to the Schoolmen, and built upon Scripture as the sole foundation. As early as the year 1512, he had discontinued the practice of reading the works of Augustine at table in the monasteries under his jurisdiction, and had introduced the Scriptures in their stead. He used to say that it was of "the greatest necessity that we should study with diligence and all humility the Holy Scriptures, and that we should also earnestly pray that we may not lose the truth of the Gospel!"

Staupitz was a mystic; but his mysticism was centred, if I may so say, in the essential doctrines of the Gospel. It grew out of that robust Evangelicalism which produced the Reformation. He was sound at heart. *The Cross*, as the only foundation of a sinner's hope, was the foundation of his hope. Without Christ, he taught, there is no true virtue or good intention. In Him all sin, if followed by repentance, is pardonable. Faith in Christ lifts man above the world and unites him to God; and in God it unites believers with one another,

and thus arises the unity of the Church. And whosoever is in Christ through faith, imitates Christ in his daily life. The aroma of holiness is shed around him from the Cross. He dies to sin and the world. All good, Staupitz teaches, proceeds from Christ, and the appropriation of His life and spirit in faith and love. Staupitz builds all salvation upon a vital inward fellowship with Christ, and through Him with God. The motto at the beginning and end of all his writings, is the beautiful one, "Jesus, I am thine; save Thou me." But even before faith, in the system of Staupitz, was *Love*, the chief virtue, the highest grace—the love of God from which, through Christ as the medium, the love of man is kindled. God is, above all things, lovely; and we must love Him for His own sake, and in Him love all men. And this Divine love is shed abroad in the heart only by the Spirit of the heavenly Father and of Christ. And where this love dwells, there will be strength to do all things, and to keep the commandments of God. A true mark of the love of God, observes Staupitz, is the fulfilment of His commandments, for love breeds conformity, and makes one heart, one will, and one mind between the lover and the loved. Love, he says again, is the offspring of love, and our reciprocal love of God, of God's love towards us, reminding us of the profound saying of St. John, "We love Him because He first loved us." Fine old teacher! a sower of good seed when so many were sowing tares! A light in a dark age, when so many blind teachers were leading the blind to destruction!

At Augsburg Staupitz made the acquaintance of Matthew Lang, the learned Archbishop of Salzburg, and became his court-chaplain. Here he changed his Order, and joined the Benedictines. He also became the Archbishop's vicar and suffragan, and did his duty honestly and well, but always keeping himself within ecclesiastical bounds. From this time his course and that of Luther, alas! diverged from each other. It is true that Staupitz still cherished much affection for his friend, and showed a certain amount of sympathy with his work. But he was not able to go with the Reformer in his uncompromising opposition to his Church. His nature was too contemplative, too antipolemical, too unheroic for that. He was, as we have said, a Christian mystic, quiet, thoughtful, spiritually-minded, deeply imbued with the teachings of Holy Writ and the works of St. Bernard and Thomas à Kempis, and averse, especially as he grew older, to the irritating and noisy clangour of controversy. Under these circumstances he had no alternative but to retire from the field of combat, and leave Luther to fight the great battle himself. Thank God, the monk of Erfurt was made of sterner stuff than

the monk of Salzburg. It deeply pained him, however, when he became aware of the inward alienation of Staupitz. "You forsake me far too much," he said in a letter which he wrote to him. "For some days I have been very sad on your account, like a weaned child for its mother. I adjure you, praise the Lord even in me, a sinful man." Staupitz answered Luther kindly, and even invited him to come to him at Salzburg, and that they would there live and die together. In fact he was still outwardly regarded as a patron of Luther; and the latter continued to write to him letters of the most endearing and faithful character. He had been too deeply indebted to him to give him up. One of his letters, dated the 17th September, 1523, contains the following striking sentence: "Even though I may have forfeited your good opinion and love, it does not become me to forget or be ungrateful to you, *through whom the light of the Gospel first began to shine out of darkness into my heart.*" And then, pointing out how questionable his position was in the vicinity of a Cardinal Archbishop, who was so zealous a Romanist, Luther adds: "I at least, with my former knowledge of you, perceive an irreconcilable contradiction in your being the same person you once were, if you continue your present connection; or if you are the same person, in your not meditating to withdraw." How sadly he feels the timid policy of Staupitz! how earnestly he longs to see him throw off the shackles that are round him, and "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made him free"!

Staupitz was a good man, "an old disciple," a lover of truth; but, like many another follower of Christ—like Fénelon, like Cranmer, like Erasmus, like John Mark, like St. Peter himself—he was irresolute in character, sensitive in spirit, and ready to sacrifice much that his reason approved in order to live a calm and peaceful life. In this he was strikingly different from Luther, whose bold and resolute spirit was never so much in its element as when, in the midst of theological conflict, "contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Staupitz's life has been compared to a bright fresh morning in spring, when the flowers have begun to appear, and the time of the singing of birds has come; Luther's to a summer's day labouring with thunderstorms and tempests, when the swift lightning rends the oak in pieces, and tumult and terror are in the air. We love to picture the one in his quiet cell, calm and contemplative—

> With looks commèrcing with the skies,
> And rapt soul sitting in his eyes—

meditating on the passion of his Lord, or on the joys of

Heaven; the other in the presence of kings or crowded assemblies, vindicating the truth, and pouring out the vials of his wrath upon the mystic Babylon. To the one, *love* is the chief grace of the Christian life; to the other, *faith*. "Staupitz reduces Christianity to the very simplest practical propositions in the doctrine of love; Luther deduces from the doctrine of faith a rich abundance of religious perceptions and theological ideas." But, notwithstanding these outward differences, Luther and Staupitz were still one in Christ, one in the inmost core of their Christian life, and could never wholly separate from each other.

In inviting Staupitz to Salzburg, the Archbishop probably designed to alienate him altogether from Luther, to withdraw his name and patronage from the bold rising monk, and thereby to give the Reformation a deadly blow. If so, the wily ecclesiastic was foiled. "Man proposes, but God disposes." Luther, left to himself, acted all the more boldly. Conscious that God was with him, he gave himself more enthusiastically and with a more solemn earnestness to his great work. He dealt the Papacy heavier blows, he urged more clearly and powerfully the freeness and fulness of the Gospel in his writings and sermons; and Staupitz, still as of old sympathetic, brought his works to Salzburg, and there made them widely known, just as, a century or two earlier, the tracts of Wycliffe were disseminated in the distant kingdom of Bohemia, and kindled the fires in which John Huss and Jerome of Prague sealed their faith with their blood. Perhaps this explains the religious movements which subsequently occurred in that district of Lower Austria. In accordance with the Divine promise, the bread-corn cast upon the waters was found after many days. We should like to believe that it was Staupitz who first introduced Evangelical and Reformation principles into those lovely Tyrolese valleys, for we can trace from this time onward their presence everywhere in the Salzburg country. One of the most touching and sympathetic chapters in Carlyle's "Frederick the Great," describes the persecution to which the Salzburgians were subjected, two hundred years after Staupitz had passed away, on account of their Protestantism. They were driven from their homes in the depth of winter, young men and maidens, old men and those that stooped for age; but Frederick threw open the gates of his kingdom to the unhappy exiles, and gave them a royal welcome.

In 1524, the end was drawing near, and Staupitz met it calmly and trustfully. His faith was firmly fixed on Christ In Him he lived, in Him he died. In one of his works, he says, "Die like Christ, and without doubt you will die

a good and blessed death. Let all who please learn from St. Peter, or other saints, how to die, or observe how good men close their lives. I will learn the lesson from Christ, and from none else. He is the pattern given me by God, according to which I am to act, and suffer, and die. He only it is Whom all men can follow, and in Whom holy living, suffering and dying, are prefigured to all, so that no one can act, or suffer, or die well, unless it be done conformably to Him, in Whose death that of all others are swallowed up." On the 28th December, three days after the festival of Christmas, 1524, Staupitz entered into rest. The master has been taken away, but the scholar far excels the master; and in the glory with which his splendid achievements in the Church encircle Luther, we see something of the lustre which, by the grace of God, shone upon the brow of the old Augustinian Vicar-General of Germany, "through whom the light of the Gospel first shone" into Luther's heart. Let us revere and honour his memory, for he had not a little to do in preparing the way for that greatest event of modern times, so fruitful of blessing to Europe and to the world—THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH.

WILLIAM COWAN.

Reviews.

Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome. By R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
The One Offering. By M. F. SADLER, Prebendary of Wells. London: Bell and Sons.
The Church Quarterly Review, No. 26. January, 1882.
The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist: an Eirenicon. By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS. Parker and Co.

WE have very recently witnessed in this Church of England what our fathers and our fathers' fathers would, we believe, have regarded as a somewhat remarkable phenomenon, the publication of a very able treatise on the Romish controversy, without a word about the Mass, either as regards the doctrine of the Presence or of the Sacrifice,—"Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome," by an eminent controversialist of vast and varied learning, who, among the many "reasons" which he urges so forcibly, has found no space for so much as one reason pertaining to that which Dean Brevint (herein a faithful representative of the divines of the English Church) declared to be "no leaf or branch, but the main stem and bulk of"[1] Romanism.

[1] "Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," p. 244, edit. 1673.

And what makes this strange thing all the stranger is, that Dr. Littledale has not spared the mention of corrupt practices and uses appertaining to the Romish system in respect of the Mass, while the very doctrine of the Mass itself is thus left absolutely untouched.[1] The omission might perhaps have been accounted for by the limitations which the writer set to his subject. Here, however, we are constrained to see that that which pertains to this doctrine can hardly be beyond its limits. The Mass is in full view. Abuses of the Mass are exposed. For the Mass itself there is silence.

But we must add, with sorrow, that there is one thing which makes this strange thing stranger still. It is that this book cannot be put down simply to the eccentricity of an individual theologian. It has been published by a Society which has some sort of claim to be regarded as the literary agency of the English Church, and has the whole bench of English Bishops among its Vice-Presidents.

This, at other times, and in other circumstances—*this*, regarded as a matter of mere *incuria*—might be looked upon as a trifle, a trifle which it would be idle to notice ; but *this*, when it is notorious that the minds of many (rightly or wrongly) have been panic-stricken at certain tendencies to assimilate the English Communion Service to the service of the Roman Church ; and still more, *this*, when some are professing themselves anxious to bring back again the Mass into the Church of England ; and yet more, *this*, while we hear perverts declaring that they are teaching the same doctrine of the Eucharist now, in the Church of Rome, which before they preached in the Church of their fathers—this, we say, can never be regarded as an indifferent trifle.

Of course we are not meaning to impute it to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge that it knows no difference in the doctrine of the Eucharist between the Churches of England and of Rome. The Society still has on its list of publications a valuable treatise which shows this distinction clearly enough.[2] Of course we do not for a moment impute it to our Bishops that they are willing to lay aside the solemn protest of our Articles against the Sacrifices of Masses. We are quite sure such an imputation would be utterly unjust. But we do venture to say that, unless the view of the Mass which has till recently been held by

---

[1] It is due to Dr. Littledale to state that in his "Prefatory Note" he says : "This book makes no attempt to cover the whole area of the controversy to which it relates. . . . It is confined strictly to a few practical questions which affect all members of the Church, laity and clergy alike, and omits not only all purely speculative discussion, interesting to theologians alone, but also all matters of which it can fairly be said that Rome and England have any common ground of agreement, however they may differ in details, or in mode of expression."

We must leave our readers to judge for themselves (after looking through the table of contents) how far this statement may be accepted as furnishing a sufficient explanation of the omission spoken of in the text.

[2] In Bishop Bull's "Corruptions of the Chuch of Rome" (an edition of which is published by the S.P.C.K.), he says : "The first article I shall take notice of is this, 'I profess that in the Mass is offered to God,' etc. . . . Where this proposition, ('That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead,') having that other of the 'substantial presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist' immediately annexed to it, the meaning of it must necessarily be this, that in the Eucharist the very Body and Blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Which is an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ made by His death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture." (Works, vol. ii. p. 251, edit. Oxford, 1846.)

divines of our Church be altogether a mistake, it is an index of a change of opinion not lightly to be regarded, if not deeply to be lamented, that such a publication, with all its unquestionable excellences, should ever have been allowed to appear with the *imprimatur* of such a Society.

As for the plea that the book must be judged in view of its special object—which may possibly be to retain in our Communion clergy who are in danger of leaving it, because they are already imbued more or less with the eucharistic doctrine of Rome—our fathers would, we are persuaded, have made short work of it. They would have said, "Eradicate from them this corrupt doctrine of the Mass. If, by reason of a strong delusion,[1] you find it ineradicable, then let Rome have her own. Don't let us have priests teaching in the Church of England, who (to use the words of Bishop Cosin), be *in* it, and are *not of* it.[2]

But now it is useless for us to conceal from ourselves the fact that Dr. Littledale's singular omission is but one symptom out of many, indicating a state of things in the Church of England which urgently demands attention—increased attention—attention which it must have bestowed upon it sooner or later.

There is unquestionably coming over some men's minds a suspicion (account for it how we may) that the repugnance to the Mass, which we have inherited from our fathers, is to be put down in good part to misconception, and in large part to prejudice; that the controversy concerning it has been looked at through a medium distorted by the feelings of indignation and passion kindled by the memory of our martyred Reformers. The thoughts of some men's hearts are asking, "Is not the time come to let these animosities drop? Have not three long centuries sufficed to keep up the heat of this fire? Is it not fitting now that we should be ready willingly to acknowledge that there have been faults on both sides? And, seeing that Romanist divines are now volunteering the confession that, in the abuses of the Mass, there has been much to account for[3] or justify the attitude of Protestants towards it, may we not, too, the rather be moved on our side also to confess that, in the doctrine of the Mass itself, there is that which admits of being viewed at least in a far more favourable light than that in which divines of the Church of England have been wont to regard it? At any rate, let us hope that now at length we may be allowed more calmly to investigate the subject, and *that* with a desire rather to look for and to find the good than the evil in the Sacrifice of the Mass. And then, may we not hope that, in the end, we may be able (as many have done already) to arrive at the conclusion that the real differences of doctrine on the Eucharist between the

---

[1] See Jackson's Works, vol. ix. p. 582.

[2] Bishop Cosin declares "That there be any such in the Church of England (unless they be *in* it and are not *of* it), who believe our Saviour hath left to His priests any such power of *real* sacrificing *His body*, etc., I am sure Dr. C—— believes not; nor that *any such power . . . . is pretended* by the Church of England. . . . . I am well assured, likewise, that he believes none of all these: trusting well by the grace of God that none will be induced by these undue suggestions either to quit the Church of England, or to join in Communion with the Church of Rome in these new fancies." (Works, A. C. L., vol. iv. pp. 284, 285.)

[3] Moehler says, "It ought not to be overlooked that the Reformers might be led into error through various, and some exceedingly scandalous, abuses, especially an unspiritual, dry, mechanical performance and participation in the most mysterious function." ("Symbolism," p. 239, Robertson's Translation, 3rd edit.)

Churches of England and Rome may be reduced either to *nil*, or to something scarcely amounting to the shadow of a shade ?"

Appeal is not unfrequently made to the earnest labours of Roman and of Romanizing priests as evidencing that their doctrine of the Mass cannot be the evil thing that some would make it. And sayings pass current from mouth to mouth to the effect that, whereas the Mass has been commonly misconceived as something which derogates from the Sacrifice of the Cross, as rightly conceived and understood by its own upholders and teachers (who should surely know best), it is that which in a very special manner honours and glorifies the Redemption of Christ.

Sentiments and utterances such as these, or more or less nearly resembling these, are more prevalent than many of us have any idea of ; and they are not confined to those who are regarded as Romanizers. Are such thoughts to be regarded as healthy or dangerous symptoms ?

No doubt in the examination of all religious questions it is most desirable that our minds should be free from the warping influences of groundless prejudices. No doubt heated feelings should be repressed, animosities should be excluded, and an atmosphere of judicial calmness should be sought. Only let it not be assumed that the result of such a calm and careful investigation of the subject must needs lead to a new view of the matter in dispute. What *we* most earnestly desire is that the doctrine of the Mass *may* be submitted afresh to the fullest and most careful scrutiny, in the clearest possible light, with the most searching examination of witnesses, and in the calmest and most judicial of atmospheres. It is a subject which pre-eminently requires to be *examined*, and examined not superficially, but with attention and study. It is a subject in the examination of which men specially need to be cautioned against allowing their minds to prejudge the conclusion after hearing the evidence and the special pleadings on one side of the case.

At the outset it should be well and clearly understood, that (whatever change may have come over *us*) Romanists are not changed at all in their attitude towards the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. Whatever may be said of approachments on the side of Romish doctors to meet the approachments of some from the side of the Church of England, it would be a great mistake, indeed, to suppose that the doctrine of the English Church is not now as much as ever a heresy, in the view of those who regard it from the standpoint of the teaching of Rome. The divines of the school of Andrewes and Laud, as well as those of the school of Morton and Ussher ; the Non-jurors not less than the Puritans, will all come under the same condemnation. If the doctrine of the Church of Rome is the true doctrine, then must the whole array of the divines whom the Church of England has delighted to honour—men whose names have stood high in the esteem of all Christian men for wisdom and learning and piety—all be accounted as heretics and impugners of the true faith of the Christian Church.

It must also be well and clearly understood that our fathers were not ignorant of the more favourable aspects of the Mass-Sacrifice which men would now bid us regard ; as if now there were for us an altogether new light thrown upon the subject. It would be altogether a mistake to suppose that in former days, any more than in our own, Romish divines *professed* that their teaching of the Mass-Sacrifice derogated from the truth of the Sacrifice of the Cross, that they were not as ready then as now to set it forth in its fairest colours, and to represent it as establishing and exalting the one atoning Sacrifice of Christ.[1] All this, we say, would be a great mistake. And it would be equally a mistake to suppose

[1] See Jackson's Works, vol. ix. pp. 581, 582, 584, 585.

that our English divines were not perfectly familiar with all that Romish controversialists had urged in its behalf. It is a subject which has its peculiar difficulties and intricacies, its mazes and labyrinths ; but it is a subject of which our divines were thoroughly masters. They were familiar with all its windings. They knew it in all its details. There is no aspect of it which they had not considered ; no form it had assumed which they were not aware of. It might be well for us if, in our own days, we were as conversant with this controversy as those who have gone before us. We should then hardly be so ready to think that in our day we are able to stand on a height from which we may look down, with something like a feeling of pity, on the errors and misconceptions of our forefathers.

And it might be well for us, too, if then we would dispassionately ask —as to the brunt of the charge which our fathers brought against the Mass, against that which belongs to its essence and can never be explained away—Is it true, or is it false ? We are not to fix our attention on any such matters as the indefiniteness of its expiatory efficacy. We are here, indeed, in a cloudland of uncertainties, though it is certain that in its clouds live miserable delusions by which simple folk are led astray. We may find its propitiatory and satisfactory character asserted, indeed, and strongly insisted on ; but then, by theologians so surrounded with mist, that, in controversy, all becomes intangible, and sometimes almost or altogether lost to view. And we must not wonder at this. There is something very hard to grasp, very difficult to apprehend in Rome's teaching concerning the Mass. Romanists and others put it down to some want of clearness in the minds of Protestants that we find it full of perplexities.[1] But in truth the Mass doctrine as a whole, as set forth in the Canons and Catechism of the Council of Trent, and as expounded by Romish theologians, is nothing less than a cruel torture to the human understanding. The mind of man when it strains itself to attain to anything like a clear and distinct view of it as a whole, finds itself on a rack. And then, after all, finds that it has been racked to very little purpose. Is it possible that even Romish minds never suffer from this torture ?

Nevertheless, though there are slippery ambiguities in every one of these terms, commonly used in descriptions of the Mass doctrines—(1) proper ; (2) sacrifice ; (3) offered ; (4) propitiatory—ambiguities to be carefully noted in the study of this controversy—yet there are certain hard and prominent features in the doctrine, which are always to be recognised even in the mist.

There is something which the priest then and there does, and does to Christ then and there really present on the altar under the form of bread, which is a real sacrificial offering of Christ, and is of availing expiatory efficacy (in some sort) for the sins of the living and of the dead. And it is (according to high authority) for this—for the sake of this Sacrifice that Christ is really present in the Sacrament of the Altar. For Sacramental purposes—for the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ—the Sacramental signs, as in Baptism, without any such real Presence in the Elements (so we are told by Bellarmine) would suffice.[2] But for the real

---

[1] See Moehler, "Symb.," p. 232, Robertson's Translation, 3rd edit.

[2] "Nullum aliud sacramentum continet reipsa corpus Christi, sed solum sunt signa visibilia, continentia virtualiter gratiam sanctificationis : neque aliud requiritur ad rationem sacramenti, cum sacramenta nihil sint aliud, nisi instrumenta sanctificationis. Quare etiam Eucharistia potuisset vere et proprie sacramentum esse, etiamsi Christi corpus reipsa non contineret. Quæ igitur causa est cur debuerit necessario Eucharistia Christi corpus reipsa continere, nisi ut

Sacrifice, such as is to be offered in the Mass, Christ must be really present to be sacrificed.[1] So much as this is, we believe, never really explained away,[2] however it may seem sometimes beclouded to Protestant eyes by assertions of identity with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

If the doctrine of the Mass is true, Christ in the Mass is *hypostatically* offered in Sacrifice to the Father. And in this doctrine of the Mass our Fathers have seen that which obscures and invalidates the One perfect Sacrifice, once offered for the sins of the world. And therefore they have not hesitated to pronounce the sacrifices of Masses to be blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.[3] Were they right or were they wrong?

---

posset vere, et proprie Deo Patri a nobis offerri, et proinde sacrificium esse vere ac proprie dictum?" (Bellarmine, "De Missa," lib. i. cap. 22; "Disputa," tom. iii. c. 1021. Ingol., 1601.)

[1] So Dr. Pusey also says, "The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon the doctrine of the real objective Presence." ("Eirenicon," p. 25.)

[2] Even Du Pin, in his desire for reconciliation between the English and the Gallican Churches, felt difficulties in concessions on the thirty-first Article, and maintained "that the sacrifice of Christ is not only commemorated, but continued, in the Eucharist, and that every communicant offers Him along with the priest." See Mosheim's "Eccles. Hist.," Soames's edit., vol. iv. p. 509. Dr. Pusey, quoting Du Pin, adds that Bishop Cosin also had said, "We still continue and commemorate that sacrifice which Christ once made upon the Cross.'" (Eirenicon, p. 230.) It is true these words are found in that early series of MSS. notes which contains (like the note from which these words are taken—see Works, A. C. L., vol. v. p. 106) large extracts from Maldonatus. But what Bishop Cosin would have said of the doctrine of Du Pin may be gathered from a note in his second series of notes on the Common Prayer: "Therefore Christ can be no more offered, as the doctors and priests of the Roman party fancy Him to be, and vainly think that every time they say Mass they offer up and sacrifice Christ anew, as properly and truly as He offered up Himself in His sacrifice upon the Cross. And this is one of the points of doctrine, and the chief one whereof the popish Mass consisteth, abrogated and reformed here by the Church of England according to the express Word of God." (Works, A. C. L., vol. v. p. 333.)

[3] That our Article was not originally directed against the language of the Council of Trent is, of course, true. But it is very hard to believe that it was not directed against just that teaching of the Church of Rome which was afterwards embodied in the Tridentine Canon, whose anathema is pointed directly against the teaching of our Article: "Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis, et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: anathema sit."—Sess. xxii. Can. 3. (See Caput ii. and Canon iv.)

Bishop Beveridge has said: "The Papists . . . agree in the thing, avouching that in this Mass they offer up a true and perfect sacrifice to God, propitiatory for the sins of the people, even as Christ did when He offered up Himself to God as a propitiation for our sins. This, I say, is *that which the Church of Rome confidently affirms, and which our Church, in this Article, doth as confidently deny.*" (On Art., p. 506.)

Moreover, it is scarcely possible to question the fact that the language of our Article was subsequently altered for the very purpose of bringing it into the most distinct contradiction to the language and the teaching of the Tridentine Canons. For, whereas the thirty-first Article of 1552 had contented itself with declaring that the sacrifices of Masses were "forged fables" (*figmenta*), and the Council of Trent in 1562 had decreed (Sess. xxii. Can. iv.), "Si quis dixerit, *blasphemiam* irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in cruce peracto, per missæ sacrificium, aut illi per hoc derogari: anathema sit," the revision of the English Articles in 1562-63, following close upon this, added the word "blasphema" to the Latin copy, making the Article read "*blasphema* figmenta sunt."

This is the question before us. Again we say, let it be investigated afresh, with all calmness of judicial inquiry. But do not let us be turned aside from the real issue. Let us remember that this is the real question concerning which we have to come to our conclusion.

Altogether apart from this is the question whether or not sacrificial language may rightly and properly be used in connection with the Eucharist. The question whether or not the Eucharist may be truly regarded as a Sacrifice is entirely distinct. No doubt there have been divines, and divines of the highest esteem in the Church of England, who, having their minds engrossed and absorbed in the grand view of that One Atoning Death, through which alone condemned man can approach to God, which alone meets the great need of a sinful world, and for which God the Son took upon Him our flesh; and regarding all other sacrifices as more or less designed to teach beforehand, and prepare the way, and lead (directly or indirectly) up to this—have reserved the term *sacrifice* to be applied in propriety of speech only to this one stupendous and transcendent event, and to its antecedent shadows.[1]

Many of our early Reforming divines might be quoted as supporting this view. But it is sufficient to name the great name of Richard Hooker, who has said that in the Christian Church we have now properly no Sacrifice.[2] And in harmony with this teaching of Hooker is the teaching of our Homilies respecting the Lord's Supper, "lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice" (p. 396), and which charges on the Romanists, that whereas "Christ commended to His Church a Sacrament of His Body and Blood, they have changed it into a Sacrifice for the quick and the dead" (p. 414). But there are others, and many of them—men,

---

And in 1571, the English version was made to follow the same example, and the expression "forged fables" was changed into "*blasphemous* fables."

These particulars have been very clearly stated by Dr. Stephens (in a note to his "Argument in the Bennett Case," pp. 214-15), who further illustrates the language of the Article "in which *it was commonly said* that the priest did offer Christ," by showing that there was no authority for this saying in the Missal itself. "By the time that the erroneous doctrine of offering the Body and Blood of Christ came to be received by the Church of Rome, the Canon of the Mass had come to be considered too sacred to be altered, so that this new oblation of Christ by the priest was not made in express words, but only by the intention of the priest while offering the oblation of the Host or Consecrated Elements." (P. 216.)

It may be added that not only was that which was "commonly said" without authority from the Missal, but it was against the authority of the most eminent Romish divines up to the date of the Council of Trent. See Field "Of the Church," vol. ii. pp. 65, 72-96, E. H. S.; and Forbes, "Considerationes Modestæ," vol. ii. p. 581 *sqq.*

[1] It is often urged that the Eucharist is, at any rate, as much a sacrifice as any of the Mosaic sin-offerings. But it should ever be remembered that each sacrifice of expiation under the law *did as a shadow take away a shadow of sin*, that by these shadows men's hearts might be taught in preparation for the truth of the One Real Atonement; and that, for the faith of the Christian Church, these shadows are all gone. (See Waterland, Works, vol. v. pp. 148, 164.) And when the shadows are gone, the reality which cast the shadows is not the Eucharist, but the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; as Origen says, "Igitur sacrificium, pro quo hæc omnia sacrificia in typo et figurâ præcesserant, unum et perfectum, immolatus est Christus." (In Levit. Hom. iv. § 8. Op. edit. Migne, tom. ii. c. 442.)

[2] "The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech usually call the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, although it hath properly now no Sacrifice." "(Eccles. Pol." b. v. ch. lxxviii. 2. vol. ii. pp. 471, 472, edit. Keble.)

some of them, of much learning, and as distinctly separate as any from the Romish doctrine[1]—who, noting that the Old Testament had sacrifices *not* of expiation, and having regard especially to the language of Christian antiquity, and the definition of "sacrifice" given by St. Augustine,[2] have claimed for the word "sacrifice" a much wider signification, and have largely insisted upon the Eucharist being regarded as a proper Sacrifice.[3]

Waterland, an able and faithful representative of this school of writers, has said of Hooker's saying, "I presume he meant by *proper* Sacrifice, *propitiatory*, according to the sense of the Trent Council, or of the new definitions. In such a *sense* as that, he might justly say, that Sacrifice is no part of the *Church Ministry*, or that the Christian Church has *no* Sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such *new language*, be the meaning ever so right; the *Fathers* never used it." (Works, vol. v. p. 140).

With some considerable diversity of expression, and some variety of doctrine, these theologians have generally not only insisted on the proper Sacrifice in the Eucharist, of alms and oblation, of praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of ourselves to be a living sacrifice; but regarding the Elements as ordained signs for the representation and commemoration before God of the Sacrifice of the Cross, have generally aimed at making prominent in their view of the rite what makes it in their language "a commemorative Sacrifice."

Nevertheless, it may be confidently affirmed that with all their strong tendency to the use of sacrificial language, these writers made no real approaches to the doctrine of the Romish Mass. They recognised and kept clear of the great doctrinal gulf which stands between the sacrificial language of the Fathers, which they made their own, and the sacrificial doctrine of the Mass to which the Council of Trent had set its seal.

Writers on the Romish side of the controversy have not failed to see the broad distinction between these two sacrificial teachings, and to mark how utterly inadequate, from the Roman point of view, is the highest point attained by the teaching of any of these divines of the English Church.

Father Ryder, in his reply to Dr. Littledale, has perhaps somewhat

---

[1] See, *e.g.*, some examples adduced in Pilkington's "Altare Christianum," cap. xix. pp. 129-135.

[2] "Verum sacrificium est omne opus, quod agitur, ut sanctâ societate inhæreamus Deo." "(De Civit. Dei.," lib. x. § 6.) See Bunsen's "Hippolytus," vol. ii., appendix, pp. 389, 390, 394. Mede says, "In a word, a Sacrifice is *oblatio fœderalis*." (Book ii. ch. vii., Works, p. 370.)

[3] Some, however, of those who have most earnestly contended for the sacrificial character of the Eucharist (especially among the earlier of these writers), have disclaimed for it the name of a Sacrifice in strict *propriety* of speech. For example, Bishop Andrewes writes: "By the same rules that theirs (the Jews) was, by the same may ours be, termed a sacrifice. In rigour of speech, neither of them; for, to speak after the exact manner of Divinity, there is but one only Sacrifice, *veri nominis*, 'properly so called': that is Christ's death. . . . That only absolute; all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it. . . . Hence it is that what names theirs carried, ours do the like, and the Fathers make no scruple at it, no more need we." (Sermon vii., "On the Resurrection," "Sermons," vol. ii. pp. 300, 301, p. c. 2.)

And so Bishop Cosin, following Callistus, "In which regard [*i.e.* praise and thanksgiving], as in divers other besides, the Eucharist may by allusion, analogy, and extrinsical denomination be fitly called a Sacrifice, and the Lord's table an altar; the one relating to the other; though neither of them can be strictly and properly so termed." (Works, vol. v. p. 347, A. C. L.; see also p. 351.)

minimized the teaching of some of them. But he is assuredly right in the main, when he says of them: "When asked the precise question, 'What is it that is offered?' they had but one answer, 'Bread and wine.' Indeed, there was no other answer they could make, whilst rejecting the doctrine of Trent (Sess. xiii. c. 1) that Christ is really present on the altar after consecration, and (Sess. xii. c. 2) is, indeed, offered up in the Sacrifice. They never answered 'Christ,' nor even 'the Body and Blood of Christ,' unless with the qualification, 'mystically present,' which they always took—at least except in the act of communion—in the sense of 'symbolically[1] represented'" (pp. 274, 275, 3rd edit.). It is true, indeed, that as regards a few of the later writers (especially Johnson and Hickes), the words "symbolically represented" might convey a false or imperfect impression. But the question of what, in the view of Anglican writers, is offered, is not affected by the question of a higher or lower efficacy attributed by a few eccentric writers to the "legal fiction"[2] by which, in their view, the elements are made representatives of the Body and Blood of Christ.[3] The fact that, in their view, what is offered is not really the Body and Blood of Christ, makes the wide and impassable gulf between their doctrine and that of the Mass. And it is but a feeble attempt to assimilate things utterly and essentially diverse, to say of these divines, as the *Church Quarterly Review* has said, that "though they might . . . fall short of the whole truth, yet they taught something infinitely nearer to the true doctrine than Waterland's words imply: something which formed a perfectly natural and sufficient foundation for the development of the truth in times to follow, when prejudice should be less and Catholic feeling greater" (Jan. 1882, p. 488).

The doctrinal gulf,[4] deep and wide, is not thus to be bridged over by a few words of apology for what, in Rome's view, is heresy; an apology

---

[1] Mr. Sadler ("One Offering," p. 149) seems unable to understand how Ridley could with consistency show such diligence in changing altars into tables, when he expressed himself so decidedly as to a sacrifice "offered after a certain manner, and *in a mystery*," (Works, P. S., p. 250). But his difficulty would vanish before a true understanding of that expression "in a mystery." It is nearly equivalent to "in a symbolical representation." Bishop Jewel said: "We deny not but it may well be said, Christ at His last supper offered up Himself unto His Father: albeit not *really* and *indeed*, but in a *figure*, or in a *mystery*; in such sort as we say, Christ was offered in the sacrifices of the old Law, and as St. John says, 'The lamb was slain from the beginning of the world.' As Christ was *slain at* the table, so was He *sacrificed* at the table; but He was not slain at the table *verily and indeed*, but only in a *mystery*; therefore He was not sacrificed at the table *verily* and *indeed*, but only *in a mystery*." (Works, P. S., "Harding Thess.," p. 718.)

[2] See Hickes's Treatises, vol. ii. p. 159, A. C. L.

[3] It will be found that Waterland, in vol. v. p. 156, gives the full value to the doctrine of equivalence for sacrificial purposes, and (p. 159) forcibly animadverts upon it. It was utterly unknown, we believe, to Bishop Andrewes and the earlier Anglican divines.

[4] Father Ryder says: "There is something irresistibly amusing in the reproaches which the *Church Quarterly* addresses to the 'great apostle of development' for not applying its principles to their teaching on the Eucharistic Sacrifice as related to that of their predecessors. No theory of development that I ever heard of, certainly not Cardinal Newman's, could pretend to recognise the germ of a doctrine in a system which begins with a rejection of that doctrine in its fully developed form, with which it finds itself face to face. The gradual process by which Anglicans have worked their way back to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which they originally rejected may be regarded as a process of moral and intellectual recovery, but it certainly is not a development in the theological sense of the word, the gradual maturing and realization of a theological idea" (pp. 279, 280).

which even the most extravagant of these writers themselves would have been among the first to repudiate.[1]

The extract from Bishop Bull, which has been so wisely inserted in what is commonly spoken of as the "Bennett Judgment," admirably well marks the distinction between that view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is within, and that which is without the comprehension of the English Church.

"In the Eucharist, then, Christ is offered, not hypostatically, as the Trent fathers have determined (for so He was but once offered) but commemoratively only; and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind of Him. For every sacrifice is directed to God, and the oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man. In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the bread and wine 'as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of His precious Body' (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy), and plead to God the merit of His Son's sacrifice once offered on the Cross for us sinners, and in the Sacrament represented, beseeching Him for the sake thereof to bestow His Heavenly blessings on us." (Works, vol. ii. p. 252.)

It is the doctrine of the Presence, the Real Presence on the altar and in the elements, which underlies and impregnates the Romish doctrine of the Mass. Without this the real Sacrifice of the Mass cannot be. In this it has its being. Rome's teaching of the Presence, and Rome's teaching of the Sacrifice, are inseparably entwined one with another, and they lie at the very root of the corruptions of the Papacy. Truly was it said by Archbishop Cranmer, "The very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the Real Presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar (as they call it), and of the Sacrifice and oblation of Christ, made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them."[2]

These doctrines, we must insist upon it, the Church of England has rejected. And in face of all attempts to reinstate them, we must over and over again reiterate the language of Hooker: "He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart, which lendeth one ear to apostles, and another to false apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and

---

[1] Let Johnson himself be called to witness: "If any of us asserted the Sacrifice of the Mass, I would readily grant that no reproaches were too hard, no censures too severe against them, who were guilty of attempting to introduce so abominable a corruption. But, my lord, it is evident to any man that is not exceedingly prejudiced, that the Sacrifice of the Primitive Church, for which we plead, and that of the Church of Rome, are substantially and essentially distinct. The Sacrifice of the Primitive Church consists of bread and wine, consecrated into the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ by the secret operation of the Holy Spirit. The Sacrifice of the Church of Rome consists (if we may believe the Papists) of the very substantial Body and Blood of Christ, together with His human soul and Divine nature, or, in a word, of the one very true Christ, both God and Man." (Works, A. C. L., vol. i. p. 5.)

Mede declared that the Churches of the Roman Communion "have depraved this mystery, and swerved from the Primitive pattern thereof; so have they for many ages disused the oblation of bread and wine, and brought in lieu thereof a real and hypostatical oblation of Christ Himself. This *blasphemous oblation* we have taken away, and justly." (Book ii. ch. viii., Works, p. 376.)

[2] Preface to edit. 1550, P. S., p.6.

superstition, ministers and massing-priests, light and darkness, truth and error, traditions and Scriptures."[1]

In the language of Bishop Bilson we declare: "The Sacrifice which Christ offered upon the Cross for the sins of the world we believe with all our hearts, and reverence with all our might: accounting the same to be perfect without wanting, eternal without renewing, and this is our Sovereign Sacrifice. The Lord's Table, which Himself ordained to be the memorial of His death and passion, we keep and continue in that, manner and form that He first prescribed, and this may be called, and is a Sacrifice, both in respect of the thanks there given to God for the redemption of man, and the blood-shedding of our Saviour, expressed and resembled in that mystery. More than this no Catholic Father ever taught, and less than this our Churches do not receive."[2]

And this, we may add, can never be reconciled with the Romish doctrine of the Mass-Sacrifice. AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

(*To be continued.*)

Ye Olden Time. English Customs in the Middle Ages. By EMILY S. HOLT. Pp. 220. John F. Shaw and Co.

Of the general reader class, few probably know much about the State Papers. In certain historical books they notice now and then allusions to Rolls, to Compotuses, Registers, and Probationes Ætatis; but of the difference between the Patent Rolls, the Close, Liberate, Wardrobe, and Issue Rolls, or of the nature of a Compotus or Register, they may know really nothing. To such readers the book before us will be a real help. It gives an explanation, brief and clear, of those documents—"State Papers"—to which from the date of King John we owe so much; and it gives also many interesting illustrative quotations from each authority, with due comment. What the documents are, in fact, is shown by quotations. And these illustrative samples, wisely selected, are so happily arranged that we learn about christenings, funerals, marriages, travelling, paying wages, and divers "customs in the middle ages," in the easiest and most natural way. The peculiar charm of this book, and, we may add, its peculiar value, is its realness. For every particular quotation, page after page, the accomplished author gives the reference. "Chapter and verse" is the key-note. Thus the reader may fancy, so to say, that his own eyes are poring over parchments, and that he is finding the place in a State Paper with his own fingers. Miss Holt is not one of the second-hand historical or antiquarian writers. Any reader of her essay in the last CHURCHMAN will at a glance have perceived that. Every statement is founded upon fact, and is the result of patient inquiry. In footnotes may or may not be contained the references. In the present work, as a rule, the references are given. But everywhere one meets, in a very readable form, the tokens of intelligent investigation, and a remarkably clear insight together with literary skill of no mean rank.

If one opens the present volume, as the phrase is, at random, something instructive is sure to meet the eye. Let us look at a page here and there, and observe the method. For example, on page 43, occurs a statement as to the washing of poor men's feet on Maundy Thursday, viz., "The number of paupers always corresponded with the years of the washer." In proof of this is a quotation as to Henry IV., when Earl of Derby, washing the feet of fifteen poor men on that day in 1382, "*because my Lord was aged fifteen years*," to each poor man his lordship gave a shilling in alms (Compotus Henrici Com. Derb., 1381-82, fol. 4). On page

[1] Edit. Keble, vol. iii. p. 666.
[2] "True Difference," edit. 1585, p. 5.

62 we read that "princes and nobles washed in silver basins;" and a statement is quoted of Earl Humphrey of Hereford, in 1361, bequeathing "a silver basin, in which we are accustomed to wash our head," *i.e.* his face (Testamenta Vetusta. i. 67). On page 131 we read that spoons were often richly wrought and beautiful things, of very costly kind; and authorities accordingly are quoted. "Two spoons, one gold and one beryl," occur in the list of articles granted to the Princess Elizabeth in 1400; and in 1401 "two spoons, one gold, one beryl ornamented with gold." (Patent Roll, 2 H. IV., pts. i. and iii.) On page 30 Miss Holt remarks: "The bridegroom always put money on the book at the words 'with all my worldly goods I thee endow,' . . . which the bride took to herself. Henry IV. thus put £2 on the book at his first marriage (Register of John of Gaunt, ii., fol. 486).

In the chapter on "Marriages" appear many choice quotations, and the whole chapter is informing and full of interest. "One important part of the bride's costume," says our author, "was the absence of any head-dress beyond a wreath, or a coronal of gems in the case of royal ladies. The hair must be left flowing straight down (a relic of Saxon custom); and this was often the last occasion on which a woman's hair was ever seen in public. The wedding-ring, in four instances which have come under my notice—Blanche Duchess of Lancaster,[1] Elizabeth Duchess of Clarence,[2] Elizabeth Countess of Pembroke,[3] and Mary Countess of Derby[4]—was always set with a single ruby, its cost being from 5 guineas to 20. The fee given to a clerk at the Queen's Chapel for officiating at these royal marriages was only £10. . . . Heralds and minstrels were always present at a wedding of distinguished persons, and were rewarded with large fees. Those given by John of Gaunt at the marriage of his daughter Elizabeth were, according to present value, no less than £150 to the heralds and £200 to the minstrels for making minstrelsy."

The chapter on "Religion" is exceedingly good. Some remarks on the ecclesiastical word "oblation" are supported by illustrative extracts. If we look into mediæval compotuses, says Miss Holt, we find that as "alms" signifies gifts made to the poor, so "oblations" signifies gifts made to God,—to the *Church*, and to the clergy.[5] This has been our own view with regard to the words "alms" and "oblations" in our Prayer Book.

The chapter on "Houses and Furniture" is excellent. The use of paper for walls, we read,

> came into England in the reign of James I., flock-papers being the kind first known. But it was nearly a hundred years before they can be said to have become common. Previous to this, the walls were always hung round with tapestry made in large square pieces, and generally known as *arras*, from the great manufactory at Arras. As these hangings necessarily projected from the wall, "behind the arras" was the convenient station for eavesdroppers. The older mediæval term for these hangings was a "hall." . . . A black bed and hall were sent from Westminster to Bruseyard Priory for the funeral of Elizabeth Duchesse of Clarence in 1364, at a cost of sixteen shillings for carriage. The Black Prince gave to Canterbury Cathedral by will his hall of plumes of ostrich, and of red and black tapestry, bordered with swans and ladies' heads, for the purpose of celebrating his anniversary every year.[6]

In this chapter some interesting extracts are given from the Lisle Papers. For instance, Master James Basset, in 1538, we read, wrote to his

---

[1] Issue Roll, Pasc., 33 Edw. III.
[2] Ibid., Michs., 16 Edw. III.
[3] Reg. John of Gaunt, ii. fol. 42 *a*.
[4] Ibid. ii. fol. 48 *b*.
[5] Wardrobe Roll, fragment, uncalendared.
[6] Register of Canterbury Cathedral, Arundel MS. 68, fol. 28 *b*.

mother, Lady Lisle, to complain as to his bed and bedchamber; and she sent her agent, Mr. Bekynshaw, to inquire into the matter. But worthy Bekynshaw was wroth to find that the young gentleman only made one of *three* in a bed which was "big enough for four great men." Privacy was an unknown luxury in those days. How many persons were stuffed into a bedchamber even nobles never cared to inquire.

It may be added that "Ye Olden Time" is well printed, and has a tasteful cover.

Short Notices.

Clerical Charities, and their Antidotes. Being a catalogue of charities, general and diocesan, for the relief of the clergy, their widows and families. By E. Geoffrey O'Donoghue, B.A., Assistant-Curate of the parish church, Hampstead. Pp. 98. J. Hall, 13A Salisbury Square.

This is a timely and useful little book. A catalogue of some two hundred and twenty charities, it is dedicated to "the poor clergy of the richest of Churches;" and the author draws a distinction between clerical poverty and clerical pauperism. Thirteen thousand of the clergy (beneficed and unbeneficed), he says, receive official incomes not exceeding £200 a year [are these figures exact? do they reveal the whole truth, we wonder?]; and as to the clergy charities, they are isolated overlapping agencies, independent, general and diocesan, without any intercommunication of any sort. The author says:

> I have elsewhere elaborated a scheme for amalgamating all the general clergy charities, and so far subsidizing the separate dioceses out of a common Church purse. But, perhaps, it may here be mentioned that there are ample funds, if properly used, for ensuring that *finality* which we desiderate.
>
> For instance, at least £6,000 a year might be saved in "expenses of management." It is, however, mainly in the *use* of these funds, amalgamated or otherwise, that the antidotes to clerical pauperism are to be discovered. It will be something to abolish a system of doles and overlapping, but it will be of far greater service to set up a system (*compulsory* or otherwise) that will help a poor clergyman to purchase for himself a sick or superannuation allowance, and to secure for his wife and children a *right* to a pension. If this little compilation (for it is no more) can do anything to forward this ideal, if the necessity for a "List of Clergy Charities" should with this ideal realized cease to exist, my little book and I will accept our signal of dismissal, not without thankfulness.

Mr. O'Donoghue comments now and then on the *expenses of management.* For instance, on page 35, touching the Clergy Sons' School, Leatherhead, he writes: "The office expenses of this school seem to us "to furnish a complete corroboration of the preceding remarks, and we "have only, in introducing a transcript from the balance-sheet, to say "that we should like to see the first item of salaries split up into its "proper details:

Rent, salaries, and auditors	£730
Furniture and fittings	37
Printing and stationery	250
Advertising and postage	93
Deputation expenses	26
Travelling, etc.	21
	£1,157

"To this should be added £341 for the 'anniversary dinner expenses "including printing and issuing special appeals, circulars, advertising, "postage, and luncheon on prize-day.' This expenditure brought in "£1,900 at the dinner presided over by Sir Stafford Northcote; but we "are not told whether the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer made any "remarks on the financial management. However, now that the feast is "over, the skeleton may be paraded, and may remind the friends of the "school that £1,500 is an exorbitant price to pay for the sum raised "(£5,741) by donation, subscriptions, and offertories. For the rest, St. "John's Foundation School (instituted in 1852) is doing good and neces-"sary work."

Trust Christ More (Thames Church Mission Society, 31, New Bridge Street, E.C.: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row). "What does T. C. M. mean on your boat flag?" inquired a fisherman of the skipper of the *Salem*. "Trust Christ More," said a gentleman standing by; and hence the title to this very interesting pamphlet, an account of the origin and development of the mission to deep-sea fishermen. When we read the paper in the "Sunday at Home," we suggested a reprint; and Mr. Mather (the able and devoted secretary of the T. C. M.), we are pleased to notice, has taken the hint.

The Church Missionary Intelligencer contains "Ten Years of the C.M.S. Missions in India," by the Rev. W. Gray, and even more than usual of interesting matter.—The *Church Worker* is bright and suggestive.—Archdeacon Bardsley's excellent "Bible Details Verified," No. X., is the "Hill of Jerusalem."

In the *Cornhill Magazine* (Smith, Elder and Co.), which has continued to improve, "Some Literary Recollections" are, as usual, clever and readable.—The *National Review* has a very interesting paper on Christopher North by Lord Cranbrook. A letter signed G. R. Portal has for its title "Churchmen and Disestablishment;" but it might have been headed "The Veto and the Vestments." One is really sorry to read the old complaints about the decisions of the final Court of Appeal, "prompted by policy," "unfairness," etc., etc. The close of Mr. Portal's letter runs thus:

> What then can be done to remedy this grievance, which is the real cause of the tension which called forth the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission? Surely this—to protect congregations which dislike the Vestments from their introduction, and to protect congregations which desire to have the Vestments in their use; and the responsibility must be thrown on the Bishops to see that this is done. It can be done by their *veto* on prosecution.

Our Golden Key. A narrative of facts from "Outcast London." By Lady Hope. With eight illustrations. Seeley, Jackson and Halliday.

A very interesting little volume. Lady Hope always writes with a sweet persuasiveness, whether in unfolding the truth as it is in Jesus, or in making statements and suggestions as to practical work. Some of the chapters in her present work are specially graphic, but all are full of interest. A portion of the narrative appears, in a slightly altered form, in the "Harvest of the City," one of the books named at the head of Mr. Kitto's article in the April Churchman.

A Light unto my Path; an excellent little book. The negative and positive aspects of Bible Teaching, eighteen chapters; by Miss E. Jane Whately (R.T.S.). Whatever Miss Whately writes is sure to be suggestive, and well worth reading.

The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain. By Mrs. Hannah More (R.T.S.). This is a cheap reprint, in large type, not only of our old favourite "The Shepherd," but of "The Happy Waterman," and "'Tis All for the Best."

Help Onward, by C. L. F.—"Short Meditations for Every Day in the Year"—has the advantage of an introduction by the Rev. N. A. Garland. This is the third edition, and we are pleased to recommend it. (Hamilton, Adams and Co.)

A very useful little book is *Object Lessons*, by the Rev. F. L. Farmer, for elementary classes in Sunday Schools (Church Sunday School Institute). So far as we have examined, the "Lessons" are simple enough and suggestive.

In the Slums. Pages from the Note-book of a London Diocesan Home Missionary. By the Rev. D. Rice-Jones, M.A., Oxon, author of "From Cellar to Garret." Pp. 210. Nisbet and Co.

The author of this very interesting little book first wrote about the London Poor ten years ago, when his "From Cellar to Garret," in which the question of overcrowded dwellings was brought forward, was published by the S.P.C.K. His object in offering these "pages" to the public is threefold. First, the personal experiences of a clergyman working in the very heart of the worst "slums" may throw some light on the question of the day. Second, it is right to call attention to the efforts which have been and are continually being made to promote the spiritual, moral, and temporal welfare of the poor by the various Church organizations in the metropolis, more especially by the London Diocesan Home Mission, and the Bishop of London's Fund. Third, the little book may bring more help and more helpers into the Home Mission field. As to the second of these three points he remarks (p. 202):

> It is time that some sort of protest should be made against the injustice done to the Church of England by those who talk and write as if they were the first and only friends of the people, and while only going over ground long familiar to, and ably worked by, the clergy, represent themselves as pioneers in lands never before discovered.

The great charm of this book is that its descriptions are the personal experiences of the writer. Its narratives are not "dressed up;" they are not second-hand. The writer lives in the district he describes; he goes in and out among the people, not merely paying them "visits." The population, about 6,000, is mostly composed of the poorest of the poor—costermongers, bricklayers labourers', scavengers, dealers in rags and bones, hangers-on of the theatres, etc. Fourpenny lodging-houses, he says, abound in the district; and it is full of other dwellings which are not half so comfortable even as fourpenny lodging-houses. Large families may still be found herding together in dark underground cellars, or in stifling garrets. Here and there are mysterious dens behind small back-yards too horrible to describe. If we take the case of A. B., a scavenger, earning eighteen shillings a week, who has a wife and seven children. They live in a wretched back room with an open recess to it; they pay a rent of six shillings a week. Two of the children sleep on the same bed with their parents; the rest in a heap on the floor in the recess. Many of the better class live after this fashion.

A shoemaker, in a house with a dozen families, said to the author:

> Would you be surprised to hear that there is only one small cistern to supply the whole of this house with water? and that the same little cistern that supplies us with water for cooking, and washing, and drinking, also supplies the water-closets, and must have a pipe opening into it from the water-closets. That is hardly a good inducement to a man to become a water-drinker.

This house, for twenty years, had "never known the smell of a bit of paint or whitewash. The floor of the shoemaker's room had been sometimes washed by his wife. But with other families, as has been said, the home-room is of a more miserable character; where, for instance, the labourer's wages are very low, or where the artizan is out of work.

Next door to the mission-house in which Mr. Rice-Jones lived, and still lives, is a cheap lodging-house, during the day opened as a cheap eating-house:

HERE YOU MAY HAVE
Hot potatoes from 6 a.m. till 10 p.m.
Two sausages and two potatoes, *always ready*, for twopence halfpenny.
Two eggs for three halfpence.
A rasher of bacon for a penny.
Bloaters at a penny each.
Kippers at one penny a pair.
A whole beefsteak pudding for threepence.
A pint of tea or coffee for one penny.
A small cup of ditto for a halfpenny;
and
Comfortable lodging at two-and six per week.

This house is much resorted to by street arabs and tramps. Of an evening the steps of the mission-house door and the pavement in front are taken possession of by a gang of lads and girls, not seldom very boisterous. At about eleven o'clock the street wakes up in earnest, and the barrel-organs are in full play; after the public-houses are closed there is a continuous uproar—singing, shouting, fighting.

The chapter on Crippled Children has a painful interest; impure air, insufficient or bad diet, defective light, etc., etc., these *tell*. As we read it we wonder why collections are not made in many churches, in the country as well as in the metropolis, on behalf of these children of the slums; would not a Diocesan Home Missionary make a good use of the gifts? A wealthy congregation in the West End might take one district of the East End, so to speak, under its charge.

This book is well printed. We strongly recommend it.

Old Year Leaves. Being Old Verses Revived. By H. T. MACKENZIE BELL. Pp. 304. Elliot Stock. 1883.

In this volume appear many pleasing pieces. The author has evidently a good deal of the poetic power; and some of his verses are soothing, as well as in the highest sense suggestive. Here is an echo of "Lord, teach us to pray":

A vast enigma is our life
Without Thy guiding ray;
But Thou, who willed, canst calm its strife,
By teaching us to pray.

Prayer! true solution of the fears
And doubts along our way;
Whose influence, coming, sweetly cheers—
What bliss it is to pray!

So when its mysteries distress,
And gloom enshrouds Life's day,
We plead that Thou wouldst make them less,
By teaching us to pray.

Dark is the path of weary woe
Whilst in Earth's night we dwell,
Yet prayer will prove a sun to show
That still Thou leadest well.

The Church in Wales. A Retrospect and a Defence. By JOHN MORGAN, Rector of Llanilid. Rivingtons.

Whatever may have been the motive of Gibbon in comparing Palestine to Wales, it is probable that all true Welshmen are ready to take such a connection between their country and the Holy Land as a real compliment. One thing is certain, and the author of the pamphlet before us puts it fairly, the most valuable and the most ancient of the hereditary possessions of the Celtic race, still theirs, is the CHURCH. The Church was planted in Wales in very early times, and has existed among a patriotic people through all the subsequent centuries without an interval and without a break. Further, to this ancient Church, as Mr. Morgan reminds his readers, is ascribed the honour of being the last National Church that succumbed to the usurpation of Rome.

With regard to the religious revival of the last century in the Principality, our readers may remember the interesting articles in THE CHURCHMAN, December, 1879, February and July, 1880. These articles were written by Canon Powell Jones, Vicar of Llantrisant, a sound Churchman, of high ability and great good judgment. Canon Jones gave a full account of the Rev. Rees Prichard, Vicar of Llandovery, author of *Canwyll y Cymry* ("The Welshman's Candle"); also, of that apostolic man, the Rev. Griffith Jones, "the Morning Star of the Revival," and of his coadjutors and successors. As to schools, the difference between the work of Mr. Griffith Jones and Mr. Charles, of Bala, was this: the latter ignored the parochial system and the parochial clergy.[1]

We do not endorse every expression of the author of the pamphlet before us, but we have pleasure in recommending it as thoughtful and timely. We may quote its concluding words as to the Welsh Church:

> If she will continue true to her scriptural and historical teaching, and to her tolerant and comprehensive character, and maintain a conciliatory attitude towards the sects which are still found standing on her confines, and still responsive to the voice of sympathy, it will be in her power to confer on us greater benefits in the future than she has even done in the past. We believe that the hearts of the children will yet be turned to the fathers, and our Church arise
>
> "A gwawr o newydd arni"
>
> (in renovated lustre). But sure we are, that if in the exigencies of political parties, and the appetency for wild and novel courses, her extinction as the National Guide and Teacher be resolved on, a floodgate will be opened for enormous changes, such as no one can contemplate without dismay.

The Hymns of Luther Set to their Original Melodies. With an English Version. Edited by L. N. BACON. Hodder and Stoughton.

A very pleasing volume. Heine called Luther "The Swan of Eisleben," although some of the great Reformer's songs are by no means swan-like, if gentleness be meant by that. Yet it is true that in Luther's hymns and songs all flows and falls in the sweetest manner. The tunes printed are those used in his lifetime; some of them are derived from the more ancient hymnody of the Church, some of them, probably (as the tune *Vom Himmel hoch*), are secular airs adapted, and the others are Luther's own composition.

---

[1] In his papers in THE CHURCHMAN on higher education in Wales, the pious and learned Canon brought out much of interest. We gladly take this opportunity of paying a brief but most sincere tribute of respect to the memory of Canon Jones, a scholar of no mean power, a devoted and humble minister of Christ. His CHURCHMAN articles of 1879-80, we may add, were quoted and commended by the venerated Bishop of Llandaff.

The Dead Hand in the "Free Churches" of Dissent. By the author of "The Englishman's Brief on behalf of his National Church." Abridged, revised, and cheap edition. Walter Smith (late Mozley), 34, King Street, Covent Garden.

The present cheap edition of this ably-written little book may open the eyes of many. "The Dead Hand," as our readers may remember, is a quotation from the Rev. Paxton Hood's complaint about "Free Church" trust-deeds :

> The trust-deed among us is a kind of dead-hand ; but the instance immediately before us [*the case of Jones* v. *Stannard*] shows that the dead-hand may suddenly become instinct with awful life, and a minister may find himself gripped by its terrible skeleton fingers, and rudely ejected from his pulpit.

An earnest and edifying little book is *Miracles of Mercy*, by Miss EMILY P. LEAKEY (Shaw and Co.). Another book of the same author, "Clear Shining Light," is known probably to some of our readers. The second title of "Miracles of Mercy" is "Asked of God," and readers will find here answers to prayer, "fact without a dash of fiction." Mr. Maurice was thoroughly right in saying, "FACTS ; *eliminate all fiction and give us facts.*" Miss Leakey gives some amusing anecdotes. Shakespeare said, "Hasty marriage seldom proveth well." A certain servant *would* marry in haste ; but soon after she (poor Mrs. Busby !) wrote to Miss Leakey :

> "DEAR MADAM,—*Do* find me a place. Busby beats my life out of me. I can't stand it any longer."

All Hands on Deck—interesting sketches—is a capital little "book for seafarers," one of the very many good and cheap illustrated books published by the Religious Tract Society. Another, suitable for a different class of readers, is *Bilihild, a Tale of the Irish Missionaries in Germany*, A.D. 703. This story of "Bilihild" is adapted from the German of Professor Ebrard of Erlangen.

A pleasing little volume is *Friendly Leaves* (Hatchard), the "Girls Friendly Magazine" for 1883.

Friendly Work for 1883 is the annual of a twopenny magazine published under the sanction of the Central Council of the Girls' Friendly Society (Hatchards).

Thoughts in the Valleys, by Captain DAWSON, may be safely recommended (Shaw and Co.). The Valley of Achor, of Ajalon, of Baca, etc., etc. ; expositions suggestive and affectionate ; a pleasing volume.

"Rutherford," said Cecil, "is a real original ; he is one of my classics." A new volume of the "Men Worth Remembering," series (Hodder and Stoughton) is *Samuel Rutherford*, by Dr. A. THOMSON ; it is well worth reading.

The new *Quarterly Review* is a remarkably good number. "Bossuet," "The Malay Archipelago," "James Hope-Scott," and "Two Royal Books," are ably-written articles, full of interest. To the review of the "Memoirs of Mr. Hope-Scott" we shall return. Father Curci's *Il Vaticano Regio* (of which mention was made in the last CHURCHMAN) is the basis of a very readable paper ; and "Lauderdale and the Restoration in Scotland" has special points of merit. The *Quarterly* well holds its own, in every way.

The *Church Quarterly Review* has reached us too late for notice. An article on "Alms and Oblations," we observe, reviews the papers in THE CHURCHMAN by Dean Howson and Canon Simmons.

THE MONTH.

THE grief caused by the death of the Duke of Albany (Prince Leopold) has been great and general. In a touching letter from her Majesty the Queen, dated Windsor Castle, April 14th (sent by the Home Secretary for publication), appear these paragraphs:

> The affectionate sympathy of my loyal people, which has never failed me in weal or woe, is very soothing to my heart.
>
> Though much shaken and sorely afflicted by the many sorrows and trials which have fallen upon me during these past years, I will not lose courage, and with the help of Him Who has never forsaken me, will strive to labour on for the sake of my children and for the good of the country I love so well, as long as I can.

The death of the Bishop of Ripon has called forth many tributes of respect. Of Bishop Bickersteth's devoted and successful labours due mention will be made hereafter in these pages.

The Franchise Bill was read a second time by a majority of 130.

The Wicliffe Quincentary Commemoration, it is announced, will be held on May 21st.

The general Mission in Dublin (under Rev. Dr. Pigou, the Rev. W. Hay Aitken, and other Missioners) has been greatly blessed. Mr. Aitken's work in St. Patrick's Cathedral was specially remarkable.

The costs of the Fitzroy case (about £400) fell upon the Bishop of Liverpool; this sum was subscribed by a few laymen who appreciate the honoured Bishop's work.[1]

Mr. Willis's motion for the removal of the Bishops from the House of Lords was rejected by 148 to 137. The 137 represented probably the whole strength of the Liberationists. "What you want," said Secretary Sir W. Harcourt, "is to get rid of the Bishops in order that you may get rid of the Church."

The Rev. C. H. Waller, Senior Tutor of St. John's Hall, Highbury, has been appointed Principal.

---

[1] The *Liverpool Courier* says: "The Bishop resolved to rid the Church in Liverpool of a sorrow and a shame, and in order that the question should be brought to a speedy issue, he accepted the pecuniary responsibilities of the promoter. The fact of the Bishop's liability became known in a circuitous way. In a short time a number of generous but anonymous friends resolved that his lordship should not suffer." The *Courier* adds: "The Bishop's laborious life must in the end commend him to all who respect hard work and unwearied devotion to the spiritual interest of the masses."